California Journal

THE LEGISLATURE

1970 Session Convenes

THE GOVERNOR

State of the State

STATE ISSUES

Environmental Quality

Conflict of Interest

POLITICAL ROUNDUP

Statewide Campaigns Begin

Key Legislative Races

JANUARY 1-31, 1970

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Month in Review

STATE OF THE STATE

Governor Reagan on January 6 presented his State of the State message to a Joint Session of the Legislature, placing primary emphasis of environmental quality. The full text of his address begins on **PAGE 15**

LEGISLATURE CONVENES

The election year session began on a partisan note in the Assembly with the Republican majority generally more unified than ever in recent years. **PAGE 5**

THE NEW SENATE

A major committee restructuring highlighted the organizing of the Senate, and marked the passing of the "old guard." **PAGE 7**

GOVERNORSHIP RACE

Assembly Democratic Leader Jess Unruh, with San Francisco Mayor Alioto no longer in the race, has his campaign well under way. An outline of his "Seventies Action Plan" is on **PAGE 23**

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

The number one 1970 issue so far is environmental quality. While everyone is for it in general, the enactment of specific programs will be difficult and costly. **PAGE 8**

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Another "motherhood" issue this year is conflict of interest, and, again, the specific proposals may prove more difficult to agree upon than the general idea. **PAGE 10**

TAXATION

At least three major tax reform proposals are due for consideration by the Legislature with good prospects that the key stumbling block to previous "reform" attempts will be removed when the Governor eases his opposition to withholding. **PAGE 13**

JUDICIARY

With the retirement of Chief Justice Roger Traynor, Governor Reagan has a key appointment to make, although it is unlikely to change the tenor of the Court's decisions significantly. **PAGE 20**

GOVERNMENT SEMINAR

A recent study indicates that while political competition is a touchstone of democratic theory, congressional incumbent safety in California is so great that there is effectively very little competition. **PAGE 24**

FACT SHEET

A major legislative reorganization proposal is explained in detail. **PAGE 21**

STATEWIDE RACES

Announcements and speculation regarding the key races for Governor, Lt. Governor, Secretary of State, Attorney General, Controller, Treasurer, Superintendent of Public Instruction, and United States Senator. **PAGE 26**

LEGISLATIVE RACES

Coverage of the key primary battles shaping up for Congress, Assembly and State Senate. **PAGE 28.**

VOTING RECORD

Record of Senate and Assembly votes on key contested issues. **PAGE 29**

GAS TAX

The first major breakthrough in the heretofore ironclad limitation on the use of gas tax revenue for highways only is contained in proposals to amend the Constitution to allow use of the tax revenues for pollution control and alternative forms of transportation. **PAGE 10**

OTHER ARTICLES

Letter from Washington by Lou Cannon ..... PAGE 14
Executive Departments ..... PAGE 19
School Finance ..... PAGE 12
Hunger Report ..... PAGE 12
Water Quality ..... PAGE 9

California Journal

Judson Clark, President

Victor H. Fazio, Vice President

Jerome Evans, Treasurer

Thomas R. Hoeber, Editor-in-Chief

January, 1970 Volume 1, Number 1

Copyright 1970 by California Journal, 1108 "O" Street, Sacramento, California 95814. All rights reserved. Published monthly. Rates are based on membership of clients and will be furnished on request. Application to mail at second-class postage rates is pending in Sacramento, CA.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

California Journal

CALIFORNIA JOURNAL is the only publication of its kind in California. It is designed to provide a source of authoritative information on state government and politics. Our reporting and analysis of the events and issues will be as free of bias and partisanship as our knowledge and understanding of the truth will permit.

CALIFORNIA JOURNAL'S purpose is not simply to record facts, but to contribute to a broader awareness of the workings of state government and the manner in which the system responds to the will of the people and their elected leaders.

Our underlying conviction is a faith in the ability of the system to respond — the capacity of informed individuals to shape that response. We believe that CALIFORNIA JOURNAL will be a reliable source for those who share this conviction.

Like the Editor of the CALIFORNIAN, nearly one-hundred years ago, We ask your support and we mean to deserve it.

The Publishers

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RONALD REAGAN
GOVERNOR

State of California
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE
SACRAMENTO 95814

Gentlemen:

CALIFORNIA JOURNAL accepts what is perhaps the highest obligation in our society: to convey to the people -- accurately, reliably and fairly -- the conduct and actions of their representatives.

I applaud any new effort to perform this task, which is really as much of a public trust as that held by those who hold public office. Your trust is to report on how those in office meet their responsibilities and to keep the people informed so that they can better judge performance.

Ours is an administration that believes, without any question, in the people's right to know; that means your right to tell them. You will be kept well informed of all that we are trying to do.

Sincerely,

Ronald Reagan

RONALD REAGAN
Governor

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LEGISLATURE

Election Year Session Convenes

"But now and then a people in a particular moment of time are called upon to rise above the norm. Their chosen representatives, elevated from politics to statesmanship, make landmark decisions — and men for decades to come hark back to those decisions and are guided in their own deliberations.

I believe we are met in such a moment of time — a moment when we should be more concerned with the next generation than the next election.

Governor Ronald Reagan
State of the State Message
January 6, 1970

Republican Robert T. Monagan of San Joaquin County was re-elected Speaker of the Assembly on solid partisan balloting after a six-hour impasse caused by the unexpected absence of John L.E. "Bud" Collier of Los Angeles, who belatedly cast the 41st vote, saying "I didn't have any idea my vote would hold up the election of a speaker. I thought Mr. Monagan had his coalition."

The straight party line vote, the first in recent decades, served to emphasize the passing of coalition elections. Traditionally, Assembly speakers have been elected with the backing of a bi-partisan coalition of their supporters who are rewarded in turn with favored committee assignments. The move toward party line voting began during Jess Unruh's tenure as Speaker, but even Monagan's election in 1969 was accomplished with a handful of Democratic votes.

Stirrings of disunity among Democrats prior to the session were settled when they agreed in caucus to support Assemblyman Vincent Thomas, dean of the Assembly. Unruh, an announced candidate for Governor, turned aside a potential challenge to his leadership by indicating that he would not continue to serve as the Democratic Floor Leader when full campaigning begins. Some Democrats felt Unruh's gubernatorial bid would conflict with his floor leadership post.

Because 1970 is the election year before reapportionment and the Republicans have only a one-vote margin in each House, the opening day partisanship and maneuvering may set the tone for the session. If the Democrats establish a unified position on an issue, the Republican majority will have to muster all of its members to prevail. On an issue such as the Governor's tax program, where a two-third vote is required, it is evident that the support of Democrats will be a necessity.

On the Senate side, the leadership fight took place in the middle of the 1969 session when Senator Howard Way painstakingly put together a bi-partisan coalition that included both liberal Democrats and conservative Republicans. On May 13, 1969, Way won the 21st vote to unseat President pro Tem Hugh Burns. His supporters included thirteen Republicans and eight Democrats.

With that leadership fight behind him, Way's preparations for the 1970 session were designed to avoid any conflict, and he was re-elected as the unanimous choice of his colleagues. Immediately, Way advanced a committee restructuring that reduced the number of pernament standing committees from 21 to 15, and he joined with Speaker Monagan in proposing a major overhaul of the traditional approach to legislative sessions (see Fact Sheet, pages 21-22).

On January 6, Governor Reagan went before the Legislature to deliver his State of the State message and called upon the members to transcend partisanship and address the imperatives of the '70's (text of the State of the State begins on page 15). Reagan devoted much of his speech to proposing an all-out war against "debauching" of the environment.

Reaction to the State of the State address followed party lines. The response of some Democrats suggested resentment that the Governor had taken over positions which had long been the preserve of Democrats. School lunch funds, conservation education, an end to oil drilling in Santa Barbara — these were issues the Governor neglected or helped defeat in years past, they claimed.

But despite the "politics as usual" tone of the opening days of the session, there were indications of a new Republican unity. In his address Reagan took time to praise the Assembly leadership for creation of an Environmental Committee, and he acknowledged his support for the legislative reorganization proposal advanced by Speaker Monagan and Senator Way even though he would relinquish some of his prerogatives to the Legislature under the plan. In addition, Reagan worked with the legislative leadership in developing a conflict of interest bill.

ASSEMBLY LEADERSHIP

Speaker — Bob Monagan
Speaker pro Tempore — Charles J. Conrad
Majority Floor Leader — W. Craig Biddle
Minority Floor Leader — Jess Unruh
Majority Caucus Leader — Don Mulford
Minority Caucus Leader — George N. Zenovich

Perhaps the most significant signs of cooperation, however, centered around preparation of the Governor's tax reform package with the prospect that Controller Houston I. Flournoy and legislative leaders Howard Way, Bob Monagan and Assembly Revenue and Taxation Committee Chairman William Bagley would jointly support a tax reform package (see tax summary, page 13).

Most observers see the signs of impending unity as ominous for the Democrats, whose past success has been based principally upon the continual wrangling among the Republicans.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEES

AGRICULTURE — Ketchum (Chm.), Berryhill (V.Chm.), Belotti, Duffy, Dunlap, Gonsalves, Ray E. Johnson, Mobley, Powers, Unruh, Wood

COMMERCE & PUBLIC UTILITIES — Badham (Chm.), Cullen (V.Chm.), Arklin, Hom, Ralph, Stacey, Townsend.

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE — Murphy (Chm.), Miller (V.Chm.), Biddle, Crown, Moorhead, Vasconcellos, Wakefield.

EDUCATION — Veysey (Chm.), Leroy F. Greene (V.Chm.), Brown, Burke, Campbell, Collier, Cory, Crandall, Dent, Dunlap, Fong, Bill Greene, Lewis, Russell, Ryan, Stull, Vasconcellos.

ELECTIONS & CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS — Priolo (Chm.), Lewis (V. Chm.), Brown, Burke, Conrad, Garcia, Bill Greene, McCarthy, Milias, Murphy, Roberti, Wakefield, Waxman.

FINANCE & INSURANCE — Beverly (Chm.), Arklin (V.Chm.), Brathwaite, Briggs, Crandall, Fenton, Foran, Karabian, Ketchum, Knox, Lewis, Moorhead, Moretti, Priolo, Zenovich.

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION — Britschgi (Chm.), Townsend (V.Chm.), Bee, Chappie, Deddeh, Fong, Sietory.

GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION — Moretti (Chm.), McGee (V.Chm.), Campbell, Cullen, Duffy, Fenton, Leroy F. Greene, Harvey Johnson, Ray E. Johnson, Moorhead, Priolo.

HEALTH & WELFARE — Duffy (Chm.), MacDonald (V.Chm.), Brathwaite, Campbell, Chappie, Crandall, Cullen, Hayes, Miller, Stacey, Townsend, Waxman, Wilson.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS — Bee (Chm.), Thomas (V. Chm.), Biddle, Conrad, Knox, Monagan, Mulford, Unruh.

JUDICIARY — Hayes (Chm.), Fenton (V.Chm.), Biddle, Foran, Harvey Johnson, Karabian, McGee, Powers.

LABOR RELATIONS — Powers (Chm.), MacGillivray, (V.Chm.), Briggs, Cory, Roberti, Stull, Waxman.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT — Knox (Chm.), Hom (V.Chm.), Beverly, Brathwaite, MacDonald, MacGillivray, McCarthy, Miller, Vasconcellos.

NATURAL RESOURCES & CONSERVATION — Milias (Chm.), Wood (V.Chm.), Barnes, Fong, MacGillivray, McGee, Mulford, Sieroty, Thomas, Unruh, Wakefield, Warren.

PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT & RETIREMENT — Deddeh (Chm.), Karabian (V.Chm.), Badham, Garcia, Ketchum, MacDonald, Wood, Z'berg.

REVENUE & TAXATION — Bagley (Chm.), McCarthy (V.Chm.), Beverly, Briggs, Cory, Leroy F. Greene, Hayes, Mobley, Moretti, Murphy, Quimby, Russell, Stull, Thomas, Wilson.

RULES — Chappie (Chm.), Gonsalves (V.Chm.), Burton, Ray E. Johnson, Mobley, Quimby, Russell.

TRANSPORTATION — Foran (Chm.), Burke (V.Chm.), Arklin, Berryhill, Deddeh, Dunlap, Gonsalves, Lanterman, Roberti, Schabarum, Sieroty.

URBAN AFFAIRS & HOUSING — Wilson (Chm.), Garcia (V.Chm.), Berryhill, Brown, Bill Greene, Hom, Milias, Z'berg.

WATER — Porter (Chm.), Stacey (V.Chm.), Badham, Davis, Harvey Johnson, Quimby, Z'berg.

WAYS & MEANS — Lanterman (Chm.), Crown (V.Chm.), Bagley, Barnes, Belotti, Britschgi, Burton, Collier, Conrad, Davis, Dent, Mulford, Porter, Ralph, Ryan, Schabarum, Veysey, Warren, Zenovich.

SENATE COMMITTEES

AGRICULTURE — Burns (Chm.), Marler (V.Chm.), Lagomarsino, Mills, Stiern, Way, Whetmore.

BUSINESS & PROFESSIONS — Alquist (Chm.), Song (V.Chm.), Cologne, Coombs, Schrade, Walsh, Whetmore.

EDUCATION — Rodda (Chm.), Wedworth (V.Chm.), Alquist, Burgener, Dymally, Grunsky, Harmer, Marler, Moscone, Richardson, Schmitz.

ELECTIONS & REAPPORTIONMENT — Marks (Chm.), Dymally (V.Chm.), McCarthy, Moscone, Schmitz, Sherman, Short.

FINANCE — Grunsky (Chm.), Teale (V.Chm.), Burgener, Carrell, Collier, Coombs, Cusanovich, Danielson, Dolwig, Lagomarisno, Marler, Short, Stiern.

GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION — Sherman (Chm.), Way (V.Chm.), Burns, Carrell, Danielson, Dolwig, Kennick, Marks, Schrade, Teale, Wedworth.

HEALTH & WELFARE — Beilenson (Chm.), Dolwig (V.Chm.), Cologne, Cusanovich, Dills, Kennick, Nejedly, Petris, Richardson, Song, Whetmore.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS — Cusanovich (Chm.), Short (V.Chm.), Bradley, Deukmejian, Dills, Harmer, Richardson, Rodda, Song.

INSURANCE & FINANCIAL INSITUTIONS — Bradley (Chm.), McCarthy (V.Chm.), Beilenson, Burns, Danielson, Dolwig, Harmer, Mills, Stevens.

JUDICIARY — Cologne (Chm.), Petris (V.Chm.), Beilenson, Song, Stevens.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT — Schmitz (Chm.), Nejedly (V.Chm.), Deukmejian, Dills, Dymally, Marks, McCarthy, Rodda, Sherman, Walsh, Wedworth.

REVENUE & TAXATION — Stiern (Chm.), Collier (V.Chm.), Bradley, Carrell, Coombs, Cusanovich, Deukmejian, Moscone, Petris, Schrade, Stevens.

RULES — Way (Chm.), Burgener (V.Chm.), Kennick, Stevens, Teale.

TRANSPORTATION — Mills (Chm.), Carrell (V.Chm.), Alquist, Collier, Marks, Marler, Schrade, Sherman, Short, Walsh, Whetmore.

WATER, WILDLIFE & NATURAL RESOURCES — Lagomarsino (Chm.), Richardson (V.Chm.), Alquist, Beilenson, Cologne, Dills, Nejedly, Petris, Wedworth.

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE CHANGES

Assembly Speaker Monagan made few changes in the Assembly Committee line-up, but Democrats claim that each had political ramifications. While no chairmen were removed, three Democrats lost seats they had held for some time. Ed Z'berg of Sacramento was removed from the Committee on Natural Resources that he had once chaired, Robert Crown will no longer serve on the Elections Committee, and Alan Sieroty lost his Criminal Procedures Committee spot.

Republicans involved in tough races this November were given added status. Clare Berryhill replaced Democrat John Dunlap as Vice-chairman of Agriculture, Henry Arklin was named Vice-chairman of Finance and Insurance and Robert Wood was elevated to Vice-chairman of Natural Resources, replacing Earl Crandall who was named to the Finance and Insurance Committee. Jerry Lewis became Vice Chairman of the Elections Committee replacing Leo McCarthy who received fellow Democrat, March Fong's Vice-chairmanship on the Revenue and Taxation Committee.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Senate Organizes

Senate President Pro Tempore Howard Way followed up his unanimous election by modernizing the Senate's traditional committee structure based on the recommendations of the Institute of Governmental Affairs at the University of California at Davis. Only after winning Senate approval for his plan to reduce the number of committees from 21 to 15 and to equalize the committee workload, did Way turn to the task of rewarding his allies for their support in the Senate's bitter internal warfare of 1969.

NO VINDICTIVENESS

He chose not to exercise the powers of his office in a vindictive manner, surprising those who had expected to see wholesale changes in the key committees of Finance, Revenue and Taxation and Education. Senator Donald Grunsky, whose vote reputedly broke the tie that gave Way his slim victory over Hugh Burns, was rewarded with the chairmanship of the Finance Committee. The closely balanced membership of the key fiscal committee puts Grunsky in a particularly strong position.

The man most observers thought would be rewarded with the job of Finance chairman, Senator Robert Lagomarsino, will instead head a new Committee on Water, Wildlife and Natural Resources which will have responsibility for hearing the many bills directed at environmental problems.

Perhaps the greatest potential change likely to result from the committee shake-up will occur in the transportation field. While Southern Californians still fall short of a majority on the new Transportation Committee, they can claim the Chairman, Senator James Mills of San Diego. A slim majority of the new members may look with favor upon the use of gas tax funds for the development of Rapid Transit facilities. In any event, the strength of the "highway lobby", the amalgamation of contractors, oil companies, truckers, teamsters and auto insurance companies, which reached its peak under the chairmanship of Senator Randolph Collier, now seems vastly reduced.

HUGH BURNS

In an ironic example of Way's policy of consolidating his gains, Senator Hugh Burns was named chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee. Burns had punished his successor one year ago by removing him from the same post, after Way's first attempt at defeating Burns had been repulsed. Several other legislators who backed Burns in 1969 were given committee chairmanships. They include Senators Walter Steirn, Revenue and Taxation; Lou Cusanovich, Industrial Relations; John Schmitz, Local Government; and Milton Marks, Elections and Reapportionment.

The Democrats whose votes allowed Way to form his successful, if unorthodox, amalgamation of liberals and conservatives, were not neglected. In addition to Mills, Senator Al Alquist was named Chairman of the Senate Business and Professions Committee, Senator Anthony Beilenson was named to head the newly reorganized Health and Welfare panel and Senator Albert Rodda retained his job as Education Committee chairman.

Although Way has attempted to avoid partisanship until his majority can be enlarged, he did give Republicans nine of the 15 top committee posts. Republicans have one-vote advantages on the key Finance, Revenue and Taxation, and Education Committees as well, and hold a majority on twelve of the fifteen committees.

CAUCUSES

In a pre-session meeting, the Republican caucus acted to remove their chairman, H. L. "Bill" Richardson of Arcadia, from the post he had held for less than a year. Richardson had attempted to unseat Rules Committee member, Senator Robert Stevens of Santa Monica, a close personal friend of Way's. Senator Clark Bradley of San Jose, whose conservative credentials rank with Richardson's, was elected to replace the Southern Californian, in what seemed to be a clear attempt to impose party discipline.

Richardson was successful however, in his campaign to remove the Senate's Policy Development Director, Harold Winkler, from his post. A long-time aide and advisor to the late Senator George Miller, Winkler was removed from his job by Senator Way who named his staff member, David B. Swoap, to the position. Way denies that he was influenced by Richardson's attack on Winkler's liberal affiliations.

Democrats generally avoided public blood-letting as they elected Senator Mervyn M. Dymally of Los Angeles to the post of Caucus Chairman, replacing Senator James Mills who resigned.

SENATE LEADERSHIP

President — Lt. Governor Ed Reinecke
President pro Tempore — Howard Way
Majority Floor Leader — George Deukmejian
Minority Floor Leader — George R. Moscone
Majority Caucus Leader — Clark L. Bradley
Minority Caucus Leader — Mervyn M. Dymally

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

STATE ISSUES

Environmental Quality: Key 1970 Issue

Environmental quality has become the most popular political issue for 1970, even replacing tax reform in the attention of elected representatives and their constituents. As a result, almost one quarter of the bills introduced thus far in the Senate and Assembly have involved attempts to meet some aspect of the environmental crisis.

Governor Reagan spent nearly one-third of his State of the State address on ecological problems saying in part, "There is no subject more on our minds than the preservation of our environment, and the absolute necessity of waging an all-out war against the debauching of that environment." His Democratic opponent Jess Unruh responded with a call for a Conservation Authority to "crack down on all factors harmful to our environment."

Speaker Bob Monagan, in announcing the creation of an Assembly Select Committee on Environmental Quality, noted "environmental problems rank at the top of Legislative concerns for this session." He went on to call for passage of a conservation Bill of Rights similar to one introduced last year by Assemblyman Ed Z'berg.

Candidates for a variety of offices, including the U.S. Seante and Attorney-General, have announced their intention to make the environment a prime issue in the campaign.

The question, however, is how far will the verbal commitment of so many carry us?

The costs to the taxpayer, not to mention agriculture and industry, will be high. The strain on our technological resources will be a real factor, not an imaginary road block as some would have us believe. Opposition from a wide variety of groups will be strong and often implacable.

Following is a brief overview of some of the proposals already introduced.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Resolutions calling on the federal government to halt the drilling for oil in the Santa Barbara Channel were introduced and a concensus measure was passed during the opening weeks of the legislative session.

Other proposals would protect San Luis Obispo County's coast from oil drilling and prohibit all new oil drilling within the Santa Barbara Channel.

Controversy continued over the way to plan and develop California's coastal resources. Lt. Governor Ed Reinecke has called for a moratorium on adverse development and suggested that new State Department of Navigation and Ocean Development should have the power to review and recommend to other public agencies what is desirable for coastal development. Assemblyman Alan Sieroty, backed by the Planning and Conservation League, has said that he will author legislation to create a Coastal Conservation and Development Commission with three regional commissions that would have development veto power until a state plan has been created. U.S. Senate candidate John Tunney will ask Congress to create a Coastline National Park.

Senator Robert J. Lagomarsino has authored eight bills aimed at creation of a series of resource conservation districts. He would improve and expand the function and powers of existing soil conservation districts.

Bills to enforce a moratorium on development on the California shore of Lake Tahoe, add more public representatives to the California Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and appropriate $75,000 from the general fund to share the cost of the California-Nevada Regional Planning Bi-State Agency operations, were introduced by Assemblyman Z'berg.

California's highways would become more scenic if several bills already introduced are passed. Three different anti-litter bills were proposed by State Senator John Nejedly and Assemblymen William Ketchum and Clare L. Berryhill. Senator James Wedworth will author legislation to help stop the growing nuisance of abandoned autos and billboards would be eliminated by Senator Anthony Beilenson under a measure which he introduced.

AIR POLLUTION

California, once known nation-wide for its smog problem, is today building a reputation as the nation's leader in eradicating the basic causes of air pollution.

Governor Reagan announced a six-point smog control program which will transform the state's fleet of 25,000 vehicles from gasoline to natural gas. His proposals include a plan for reducing the state tax on natural gas as an added incentive to drivers converting to liquid gas.

The State Air Resources Board in January adopted automobile air pollution regulations for 1975 models which were described as the most stringent ever developed. If approved by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the regulations would cut carbon monoxide 50% and hydrocarbons and oxides of nitrogen by 75% from 1970 emission standards.

AB 1, authored by Assemblyman Biddle, is an attempt at making the automobile buyer conscious of the problem of air pollution. A statewide inspection system for new and used cars would be created, and a new schedule of license fees would be established to discourage the use of older cars and high horse-power models and encourage the use of other types of fuel. In addition, 25% of state gas tax monies would be diverted for other transportation (see Gas Tax, page 10).

The Assembly Transportation subcommittee on Air Pollution chaired by Assemblyman Pete Schabarum introduced a package of 18 anti-smog bills. Six of the measures toughen motor vehicle air pollution laws, three require changes in the content of gasoline, three clarify the legal rights of government and private citizens involving pollution problems, and six further strengthen laws regarding stationary sources of air pollution.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HIGHER EDUCATION

Tuition for students at the University of California and the California State Colleges will again be a major issue before the Legislature and the two governing boards. Indications are that the administration is prepared to submit legislation to establish tuition for the state colleges just as soon as the Regents take action for the University. There are still strong differences of opinion, however, as to what form tuition should take. Assemblyman Collier's near victory for his perennial deferred tuition plan at the last session has encouraged educators to find some alternative which they can accept.

The principal contenders at the moment are Collier's deferred tuition plan, the Governor's deferred tuition proposal, Assembly Speaker Monagan's graduated tuition plan, and the flat charge proposed by University of California President Hitch to finance student aid and capital outlay. Opponents of tuition hope that the division among the advocates of tuition will continue long enough to forestall action for at least one more year.

CONSTITUTION AMENDMENTS

Two important issues will be placed before the Legislature by the Constitutional Revision Commission. The Commission will recommend that the framework of the existing governance structure, including the State College Trustees, the Coordinating Council for Higher Education and a junior college governing board, be added to the Constitution. The Commission will recommend that the composition of the Coordinating Council be changed to provide for a stronger public representation but keep the council's powers very restricted. The Commission will also recommend revision of the Constitution to permit public aid for private, nonsectarian, higher education. Introduction of this issue is expected to produce some real measure of public sentiment regarding the use of public funds for the support of private education at any level.

Another major issue just beginning to surface is the question of whether California's public institutions of higher education are admitting all the qualified students who seek admission. Based on fragmentary reporting systems, both the University and the state colleges contend that, to the best of their knowledge, they have not actually turned away any eligible students. This supports the Governor's declaration that no eligible students have been or will be turned away, despite numerous protests to the contrary. Chancellor Glenn S. Dumke of the California State Colleges was subjected to sharp questioning by several legislators recently, indicating rapid erosion of patience among members of the Legislature on this question. The tight budgets for 1970-71 and the inability of the state to meet its building needs are certain to intensify debate on this question over the next year.

WATER QUALITY

Capitol observers seeking to measure the Administration's commitment to environmental quality are watching implementation of the new, tough, Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act which was passed last year and went into effect January 1.

California's water pollution control laws have been the most advanced in the nation, beginning with the Dickey Act in 1949. At that time nine regional water pollution control boards were set up, coordinated by a part-time state board. The focus was on individual polluters, with enforcement in the hands of the district attorney.

In the Sixties the concept of water quality began to replace that of water pollution, and California water law began using the term without altering the focus on individual waste dischargers. In 1968 Carley V. Porter, Chairman of the Assembly Water Committee, initiated a study of water quality control in the State which resulted in the Porter-Cologne Act.

CONTROL PROCESS. The Act vests responsibility for water quality control and regulation in a State Water Resources Control Board with five full-time members, appointed by the Governor. Nine regional boards have nine part-time members each, also Governor-appointed. These boards formulate water quality control policy which binds all but federal facilities.

The water quality control process begins when a regional board establishes a water quality control plan listing "beneficial uses" to be protected, defining physical and chemical water quality objectives, and planning implementation, including adoption of waste discharge requirements for each discharger.

COMPLIANCE. Regional boards may request a time schedule for compliance if requirements are violated. Where compliance is not forthcoming, enforcement tools include cease and desist orders, injunctions, clean-up paid for by the polluter, and, as a last resort, a $6,000 per day civil fine.

Other changes in the Porter-Cologne Act:

- expansion of regional board membership to add more public members;
- enforcement of civil provisions by the Attorney General who may have more expertise than a district attorney who deals with water cases only infrequently;
- direct enforcement of discharge requirements. In the past, enforcement officials had to prove that a discharger was solely guilty of creating pollution. Now the Attorney General need prove only that the beneficial uses and the waste discharge requirements are reasonable. Thus, earlier and more aggressive action is possible.
- if a public agency's waste treatment facility is operating under a cease and desist order, the regional board may prevent new factories and subdivisions from adding more waste to the plant, thus curtailing community growth.

The Porter-Cologne Act is a strong one. Only piecemeal water quality legislation is likely to be successful in 1970 while attention centers on actions taken and funds provided to implement the Act.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONFLICT OF INTEREST BILLS

Assembly Speaker Bob Monagan on January 28 introduced AB 430 to implement major changes in the State's conflict of interest laws. President pro Tempore Howard Way was due to introduce identical legislation in the Senate on February 2.

Key provisions of the legislation are as follows:

Consolidates the scattered conflict of interest laws into one unified act, with a common set of definitions and consistent approach;

Eliminates the Joint Legislative Ethics Committee and establishes separate commissions on ethics and conflict of interest for the legislative and executive branches;

Prohibits a former state officer of employee for a two year period following his termination from receiving compensation for any service rendered on behalf of any private interest in relation to any transaction in which the person had, as an employee, been directly involved;

Strenthens and revises various provisions of the 1969 "disclosure" law; and

Reduces from $500 to $100 the amount which must be reported as a contribution separately (with the contributor's name) to any candidate for public office.

COMMISSIONS. The Executive Commission would be composed of five members appointed by the Governor to serve at his pleasure. At least one member would be actively employed in the state's civil service system, and one member would be an appointive officer exempt from the civil service system. Each of the remaining members would be private citizens with experience in public and civic affairs.

The Commission would be authorized to employ staff assistance and would have the full range of investigative powers normally accorded a state fact finding commission. It would be given the continuing responsibility to coordinate, administer, evaluate and study the state's conflict of interest laws as they apply to members of the Executive branch. The Commission also would be responsible for recommending changes and additions in the law to the Governor and the Legislature.

The Legislative Commission would be composed of seven members, all of whom would be private citizens appointed for two-year terms. The appointments to the Commission would be made by the Joint Rules Committee (composed of Assemblymen and State Senators) and would reflect choices made by the majority and minority party in each House. No member of the Legislature would serve on the Commission. Its functions and powers would parallel those of the Executive branch commission.

Each commission would be empowered to act on its own initiative or on the receipt of a notarized complaint and would also be required to develop and implement an information program to acquaint all persons covered by a conflict of interest statute (or other writing) of their obligations under its provisions.

DISCLOSURE LAW. A number of extensive changes are proposed for the 1969 Disclosure Law. The first change specifies those assets that must be disclosed and those which need not be disclosed. The new law would reduce the value of an asset that must be reported from the present $10,000 to $1,000. It would be necessary, however, for the filing only to indicate whether an amount over $1,000 is less or greater than $5,000. The specific value would not have to be listed. Exemptions would include bank checking and savings accounts, shares in a credit union and the cash surrender value of a life insurance policy.

The second change would bring state civil servants under the disclosure provisions, recognizing that many employees are daily exposed to situations which might result in a conflict of interest.

The third change is principally for local government and would establish certain distinctions between levels of public servants. Elected state and local governmental officials, as well as officers of these entities, would disclose all assets. Appointive non-salaried officials, however, as well as appointive non-salaried members of boards, commissions and committees, would disclose only those assets regulated by the public entity which they serve. Members of special district governing boards and school boards also would be required to disclose only those assets regulated by their agency.

Finally, a new disclosure requirement would mandate almost immediate disclosure of the acquisition of any additional personal interest in a business entity regulated by the officers' or employees' appointing authority.

GASOLINE TAX

The first major break in the highway lobby's hold on the use of the State revenues from gasoline taxes came this month when the California Constitution Revision Commission voted to recommend a broadening of Article 26, the Constitutional provision which currently restricts expenditures of these moneys solely for highway use.

The Commission's recommendation retains "special fund" protection for user taxes but expands the permissable uses of these revenues to include: 1) capital outlay for public transportation systems; 2) control of environmental pollution caused by motor vehicles; and 3) payment of principle and interest on revenue bonds issued for these or road construction purposes.

The Commission's action marks the beginning of a major campaign to make California's highway construction program compete equally with other transportation priorities for available revenues.

As a compromise position on public transit financing, the Business and Transportation Agency is countering with the recommendation that Article 26 be amended only to allow local governmental units to levy an additional fuel or sales tax, the revenues from which could be used for any transportation purpose. The Agency's position is said to represent the Governor's view. However, in testimony presented to the Constitution Revision Commission, the Department of Public Works opposed a local tax option on the grounds that highway deficiencies are too great to warrant expenditure of revenues for other forms of transportation. The executive branch is unified in its

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

support of amending the Article to allow user taxes to be spent on pollution control projects.

SUPPORT

Some 150 different organizations, citizen groups, and individuals presented testimony, resolutions, and letters to the Commission, indicating far greater interest in the issue than was anticipated.

Support for revision came from a variety of organizations including the League of Women Voters, Jaycees, Sierra Club, Clean Air Council, Association of Publically Owned Transit Systems, California Association of Life Underwriters, Peninsula Manufacturer's Association, and Roadside Council.

Supporters of revision argue that vehicle-related pollution is a critical problem, the solution of which requires both immediate funding and a long-term shift from the private auto to cleaner public transportation systems. The use of highway taxes for these purposes is doubly effective in that the taxes are being used to reduce the problem at the same time as helping to finance a solution to the problem.

OPPOSITION

Representatives of California's well-organized highway interests presented extensive testimony to the Commission defending the existing Constitutional provision. Their position is that no funds should be channeled away from road construction until all highway needs are met. They also argue that the highway user will not directly benefit from improved public transit, and therefore it would be unfair to use fuel tax and license fee revenues for that purpose.

The Commission recommendation will be incorporated in legislation to be introduced by John Foran, Chairman of the Assembly Transportation Committee, early in February. Related bills have already been introduced by Assembly Majority Floor Leader Craig Biddle and Senator Milton Marks. The Biddle proposal specifies that 25 per cent of the gas tax could go for other transportation purposes. Marks' bill authorizes the use of the fuel tax for any public transportation purpose.

Acknowledging defeat at the Commission level, the highway lobby is mounting an extensive campaign against revision of Article 26. Representatives of the Auto Clubs, the Highways Users Conference, the Western Oil and Gas Association, the California Trucking Association and the State Chamber of Commerce are making presentations to legislators to stop the Commissions's recommendation. In case these efforts fail, the State Chamber is preparing a grass roots campaign to defeat the ballot measure in November.

THE BUDGET

Legislative Analyst A. Alan Post told the Ways and Means Committee on January 20 that state expenditure increases of 19% in 1968-69 and 17% in 1969-70, largely reflecting the cost of property tax relief, health care services, education and social welfare, have depleted the surplus from the 1967 tax increases. Most of this surplus was used to balance the 1969-70 budget, according to Post, leaving only $115 million for 1970-71.

Early estimates of state expenditures by Post's staff suggest that the Governor will have considerable difficulty holding 1970-71 expenditures to an increase of no more than 8½%. Post believes that state revenues may increase by only about 6%, reflecting the national economic slowdown. If this happens, and the state continues to be unable to sell bonds to meet its most pressing capital outlay needs, Post's early figures indicate a total potential deficit of about $281 million. After deducting the remaining surplus of $115 million, this potential deficit is still $167 million.

The Governor is required by the State Constitution to submit a balanced budget, however, and much of the legislative debate will be focused upon the manner in which he proposed to accomplish that feat. The Governor has pledged that whatever tax changes he proposes will not increase taxes. Although he may anticipate a somewhat greater increase in revenues than does the Legislative Analyst, he will still be confronted with a need to make some sharp and painful reductions in state expenditures for 1970-71.

In responding to Post's forecast the Governor and his new Finance Director, Verne Orr, indicated that the administration may ask for special legislation permitting a reduction of $100 million in statutory spending requirements — possibly in the social welfare area. If the Governor does rely on a request for such special legislation as a means for presenting a "balanced" budget, it is certain that Democrats in the Legislature will immediately question this as a valid compliance with the Constitution.

Another alternative open to the Governor would be to accept withholding of state income tax which would not only give him the revenue he needs but would put the Democrats, who have pushed hard for withholding, in the difficult position of either reversing themselves or providing support for the Governor in securing passage of his budget.

CALIFORNIA CALENDAR

In each issue, CALIFORNIA JOURNAL will list meetings of civic, political and governmental bodies.

Coordinating Council for Higher Education, Sacramento, February 9.
Assembly Water Committee, Hearing on State Water Project, Sacramento, Feb. 9.
Assembly Criminal Procedure Committee, Hearing on Criminal Justice Council, Sacramento, February 11.
State Board of Education, San Francisco, February 12-13.
Assembly Urban Affairs and Housing Committee, Hearing on Human Resources Development Department, Sacramento, February 18.
California Community College Board, Sacramento, February 18-19.
California State College Board of Trustees, Los Angeles, February 24-25.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Malnutrition and Poverty

The Assembly Public Health Committee on January 12 issued a report entitled *Malnutrition: One Key to the Poverty Cycle*. The report, marked *URGENT*, says there is "mounting evidence that hundreds of thousands of California children live in families whose incomes are so low that maintaining an adequate diet is a daily struggle, at best precarious and all too often impossible."

Linking malnutrition to mental and physical impairment, the report indicates that between 55 and 65 percent of current Aid to Families with Dependent Children cases must live on incomes below the minimum basic standard of adequate care defined in the State's Welfare and Institutions Code.

When income is insufficient, the report argues, it is likely that one of the first budget cuts will be nutritious food.

In an attempt to break the poverty cycle, the Committee recommends:

- Raising the AFDC grant "so that the total purchasing power of a family, including food stamps, will equal its minimum needs."
- "Establishing an automatic adjustment in the maximum AFDC grant so it reflects changes in the cost of living, as is now done in the welfare programs for the aged, blind and disabled."
- Assuring that "all low-income persons will have access to the increased food purchasing power made possible through (the federal food stamp) program."
- Providing "all economically needy school children ... free or reduced-price school meals" at state expense, and urging Congress to honor its commitment under the 1946 National School Lunch Act by assuming this reponsibility itself.

The last proposal, including an appropriation of $6,000,000, was introduced as AB 318 by Assemblyman Gordon Duffy, Chairman of the Health and Welfare Committee, and all members of the committee. A similar proposal by Senator George Moscone, allocating $3,000,000 for school lunch programs, is contained in SB 1.

Senator Alfred E. Alquist has introduced SB 87, which would implement the Assembly Committee recommendations that the AFDC grant maximum be raised and that, in the future, grant levels be tied to the cost of living. An alternative approach is contained in Alquist's SB 88, which would eliminate the maximum aid payment, instead tying grant levels directly to the existing minimum basic standard of care definition in the Welfare and Institutions Code.

SCHOOLS

Tax "reform" will be the major issue affecting the public schools in 1970. The California Teachers Association/County Supervisors Association of California initiative, the Gonsalves plan backed by a large contingent of Democrats and the Republican tax reform package will all have major impact on the financing of the state's local education programs. (For a discussion of tax reform see page 13.)

The perennial debate on the need for an increase in state apportionments to the public schools is likely to focus on two proposals, a "cost-of-living" increase in foundation programs of perhaps 5% and a special allowance for large urban districts. A cost-of-living increase of 5% would cost the state about $75 million, however, and the source of such additional support is not visible at this time.

The one other major school issue likely to come before the Legislature is the matter of teacher credentialing reform. AB 740, Assemblyman Leo Ryan's bill which passed the Legislature last year only to be vetoed by the Governor, will be reintroduced. This year, however, the Governor may also put in a bill of his own, which, if it follows the advice of his Commission on Educational Reform, will go even further than the Ryan bill toward reducing the number of teaching credentials and streamlining the process by which credentials can be obtained. It now appears nearly certain that a credentialing reform measure will be signed into law this year.

Other measures likely to receive legislative attention are increased support for bilingual education, experimentation in improving elementary education, experimentation in improving elementary instruction, and modification of the state building aid program to help urban districts. Senator Harmer's Committee to Study the Reorganization of Large Urban School Districts is expected to report late in the session, but the prospects for major action in this area do not now appear to be very good.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TAX REFORM PROPOSALS

A new Republican unity may result in a tax reform package supported by Governor Ronald Reagan, Controller Houston I. Flournoy and Legislative Leaders Howard Way, Bob Monagan and Assembly Revenue and Taxation Committee Chairman William Bagley. The withholding of state income taxes will be part of the plan, which will cut property taxes by 40 per cent on lower-priced homes and 20 per cent on more expensive dwellings.

Meanwhile, Democratic Assemblyman Joe A. Gonsalves of Norwalk has announced that forty Democratic Legislators would co-author a Constitutional Amendment that would produce a $1 billion reduction in property taxes. This proposal, which has been endorsed in principle by Assemblyman Jess Unruh, could appear on the November ballot, if its sponsors can collect 520,276 signatures of registered voters by June 18. Its chances of gaining the approval of two-thirds of the Senate and Assembly and appearing on the ballot in that fashion are almost nil.

Although the details of the Republican plan are not yet available, it must be assumed that the bulk of the $600 million to $1 billion shift away from property taxes will mean that some additional revenue will be raised from income and sales taxes. A reduction in the oil depletion allowance from 27½ to 22 percent, a statewide equalized property tax for schools, state assumption of some county welfare costs and limitations on state grants to those counties which raise local taxes, are reportedly part of the Governor's proposal as well.

The Republicans plan to cut property taxes by increasing from $750 to $1,000 the homeowners property tax exemption. Gonsalves' initiative will produce savings for homeowners by exempting single-family owner-occupied homes from school taxes and by limiting combined tax rates on the homeowners' property for purposes of supporting local government to $1 per $100 of full cash value. State loans, bonds and approved taxes would be excepted from the limitation.

Under the Gonsalves Initiative plan, the state would then replace all the revenue lost to local government by the 1 per cent tax limitation. In addition to the funds obtained through withholding of state income tax and the elimination of the current homeowners property tax exemption of $750, $500 million would be raised by increasing the insurance tax, bank and corporation taxes, alcoholic beverage and cigarette taxes, inheritance and gift taxes, horse racing fees, taxes or licenses, revised depletion allowances, and taxes on the severance of oil and other natural resources.

Critics of the Democratic plan point out that it avoid dealing with the inequalities of current school finance methods and would create an inelastic revenue structure by preventing use of the sales and income tax.

THE BALLOT. Much of the pressure for legislative tax reform has been created by the threat of several tax reform proposals appearing on the November ballot.

In addition to the Republican package and the Gonsalves plan, a joint effort of the California Teachers Association and the County Supervisors Association of California to place their tax reform measure before the voters may succeed in November, unless the courts allow them to qualify for the June ballot. Assistant Secretary of State H.P. Sullivan has ruled that the CTA-CSAC plan failed to qualify by the January 22 deadline, but Association spokesmen maintain that precedent is on their side and that voters will have their measure before them in June.

The CTA-CSAC plan would require the state to assume 90% of county welfare costs and to fund 50% of local school costs in California. They would also increase the homeowners exemption from $750 to $1,000 on assessed valuation. The Legislature would levy state taxes to make up for the additional cost of $900 million to be born by the state. The Department of Finance and the Legislative Analyst indicate the shift is more likely to total $1.5 million.

SINGLE TAX. Sacramento Assessor Dr. Irene Hickman is pushing an initiative measure to inaugurate "the single tax" formula for property taxation. In essence, her plan would impose a tax on the value of the land and eliminate levies on improvements. Senator Albert S. Rodda of Sacramento will carry legislation to place the measure on the November ballot, although Dr. Hickman will attempt to qualify her plan by gathering signatures as well. Conservationists concerned about pressure on open space preserves have expressed misgivings about her plan.

The author of the controversial Proposition 9 which appeared on the ballot in 1968, Los Angeles County Assessor Philip E. Watson, may also lead a new initiative measure. Watson indicates the plan will modify Proposition 9 by earmarking the taxes by which the Legislature must raise new revenue and by removing the local bonding limitations formerly imposed. His basic plan continues to limit property taxes to 1% of market value and restrict use of such revenues to government related expenditures such as police and fire protection.

Supervisors Robert Mendelsohn and Terry Francois of San Francisco are trying to qualify a plan that would allow for a different assessment ratio for homeowners. They would reduce the current 25% ratio for single family dwellings to 15%, while maintaining the present figure for all other property. Their plan would also allow renters a credit against their state income tax and give senior citizens further relief.

The split assessment proposal would be the cornerstone of San Francisco Assessor Joseph E. Tenney's 10-point tax relief program which requires that the state pay for all education and welfare costs. Assemblyman John Foran of San Francisco has introduced ACA 1 to amend the Constitution to provide for split assessments between private owner occupied dwellings and commercial property.

PROSPECTS. Capitol observers noting that all of the plans before the Legislature will require two-thirds approval see the prospects for tax reform in this crucial political year to be severly limited. The Republicans may have effectively stolen the thunder of the Democrats if they can convince Governor Reagan to acquiese in withholding of state income taxes. However, if the Democrats can stand together in support of the new state taxes proposed by the Gonsalves plan they may have a strong weapon to use against an administration which chose to increase income or sales taxes instead of taxing industry.

But the arguments are complex and the points fine. If no basic tax reform emerges from this session of the Legisla-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ture, the voters may turn to the ballot propositions to seek redress and the Legislature, and perhaps even the Governor himself, will suffer a major loss in public esteem.

A major complicating factor in the already tangled tax reform picture is an estimated $167 million revenue deficit which may occur during the next fiscal year beginning July 1. This factor combined with fear that voters might reject Proposition 7, which would permit an increase in the maximum interest on state bonds to 7%, would perhaps force the state to raise taxes as well as reform the tax structure. The Governor has maintained that he will not increase taxes in 1970 and says he will ask for additional flexibility in deciding how the state will spend portions of the budget directed now by special fund allocation.

OTHER CHANGES. Assemblyman William T. Bagley has introduced the "Clean Water Act of 1970" which would allow the State Water Resources Board to impose a $322 million statewide property tax to finance a 5 year campaign to clean up California's polluted water.

A new State Environmental Fund would be created and financed by a limitation on the depletion allowance to actual costs incurred in each new exploration instead of the current 27½% of yearly gross income under AB 7 introduced by Assemblyman Gene Chappie.

Individual taxpayers could collect 6% annual interest on any over payment made under an advance tax payment plan under AB 367 authored by Assemblyman Bob Moretti. Senior citizens could deduct the income of residents living in their homes before determining if they qualify for tax refunds under legislation introduced by Assemblyman John Dunlap.

Homeowners would not have to apply annually for property tax exemptions under SB 244 authored by Senator Alquist. The exemption would remain until the property changed title.

Assemblymen Bagley and Moretti and Senator Lewis Sherman have introduced AB 368 to eliminate the duties of the Inheritance Tax Appraisers regarding inheritance and gift taxes and probate of estates, and to establish a civil service function in the state controller's office.

The Bank of America announced that it would reduce its one time fee on tax payments made through Bank-Americard to 1% from 4% on income borrowings paid by the end of the month. The Bank said volume permitted the reduction. Assemblywoman Yvonne Brathwaite and Assemblyman Alan Sieroty had criticized the bank for what the termed the excessive rate.

LETTER FROM WASHINGTON

EDITOR'S NOTE: As a regular feature CALIFORNIA JOURNAL will run observations on the nation's capitol by journalist Lou Cannon, author of Ronnie and Jesse: A Political Odyssey. Mr. Cannon, formerly Sacramento bureau chief for the San Jose Mercury-News, is now on the Washington bureau staff of Ridder Publications. His views on Washington will focus on the Californians serving in the Nixon Administration, the Congressional delegation and analysis of developments which have a particular relation to California. The following is from a personal letter Mr. Cannon wrote shortly after his arrival in Washington.

I walked by the White House tonight, conscious that This Was History and wondering what was going on In There and thinking that the light is bright — too bright — at the entrance and that there is not much light anywhere else except at the guardhouse that watches the entranceway on Pennsylvania Avenue.

The marvelous thing about the White House is that it is really not that impressive at all and that the man who lives in it is addressed by the least impressive title of "Mister" and yet it radiates power and importance, is somehow so aware of its own power and importance, that one cannot take one's eyes off the place as one walks by. There are many buildings in Washington that far more readily attract the eye. The Capitol makes one's heart leap but the White House is more convincing, somehow. Perhaps that is the difference between power and influence.

The old Californians, those people I knew from Sacramento and before, include Lyn Nofziger, Jim Alexander, Phil Burton, Jerry Waldie, Gil Bailey, and a host of other refugees from one California administration or another. The Californians stick together here like a government in exile. At the same time, and somewhat to my puzzlement, there is little of the mixing between strata that is so common in Sacramento. Perhaps it is different on the rarified social levels, but congressmen here socialize mostly with congressmen and staffers with staffers. Newspapermen, on the other hand, seem more mobile here than anywhere, which may be why so many of them like Washington.

Sincerely,
Lou Cannon

NEWS NOTES

* The much discussed "swap" of state redwood parks for federal beach lands along the California coasts is not permitted by federal law, according to the Department of Defense which holds title to the beach lands. The plan has been frequently mentioned in the Reagan Administration because the Governor felt California should not contribute the three parks to the federal government without getting some land in return.

* Caspar Weinberger, former director of the Department of Finance took office as Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission on January 1.

* U.S. Senators George Murphy and Alan Cranston introduced on January 28 legislation which would ban new drilling along 16 miles of federal off-shore lands and would permit cancellation of 20 oil company leases where production has not begun.

* Congressman Jerome Waldie of Contra Costa County, who used to call himself "an establishment guy" when Democratic Majority Leader in the State Assembly, has become the chief antagonist of 78-year old John McCormick, Speaker of the House of Representatives. Waldie has indicated that he's so dissatisfied with the ancient procedures and stolid pace of the House that he will run for McCormick's position, if no one else will.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Reagan State-of-the-State: Full text

Following is the complete text of Governor Reagan's State-of-the-State message to a Joint Session of the Legislature, January 6, 1970.

To the Honorable Members of the Senate and Assembly:

It is in the nature of things that at such a joint session of this Legislature I'm expected to deliver a State of the State Message boasting about some of the things this administration has already done — and listing some of the programs we intend to launch during the coming year. Traditionally this recital of hoped-for legislation is referred to as "the laundry list."

It is also in the nature of things that such messages be debated, sometimes with more heat than light. Rebuttals are prepared even before the remarks are formally delivered; some excoriate and some defend, some decry omissions and others praise inclusions.

But now and then a people in a particular moment of time are called upon to rise above the norm. Their chosen representatives, elevated from politics to statesmanship, make land-mark decisions — and men for decades to come hark back to those decisions and are guided in their own deliberations.

I believe we are met in such a moment of time — a moment when we should be more concerned with the next generation than the next election.

Just six days ago the world embarked upon a new decade. It brought with it the achievements and the scars of the sixties. It signifies more than just a measured span of years — it introduces its own imperatives, and it stirs our souls for a new spirit.

Since we last met like this — on January 7, 1969 — about 300,000 individuals have been added to our state's population. It is predicted that by 1980 there may well be some 25 million people living within our state.

Every year, as our population grows and our problems increase, we are called upon to perform minor, even major, miracles for, while such growth can mean progress, it can also mean degradation.

We are already faced with a chronic shortage of funds for such capital facilities as the State Water Project because of the tight money market. The proposition on the June ballot, which will allow us to raise our interest rate ceiling, must pass or we will face serious, almost chaotic, contractual and construction problems.

We are challenged to protect the safety and the liberty of our citizens and to provide the proper climate for economic development while preserving our priceless, irreplaceable natural resources. We seek ways to accommodate those who want to share in the magic of California, without allowing that magic to be swept away by a wave of people and pollution.

And, we must provide all of these services and all of these protections without confiscating more and more of the taxpayers' earnings — and without depleting the risk capital which is vital to our economic expansion — and to jobs and job opportunities for our growing population.

These are some of the imperatives of the seventies that should bind us together in common effort. They demand a common commitment greater than any personal ambition and stronger than any partisanship.

This being an election year, there will no doubt be many evidences of partisanship — and properly so. The two-party system is essential to our government of free men. It ranks with our federal system of sovereign states as the great safeguard of our freedom. It is important that we argue things out — so long as we argue about the right things.

In the coming weeks and days, I will deliver to you definitive messages and specific requests for legislation dealing with some of the imperatives of the seventies. The laundry list will come in installments.

QUALITY OF LIFE

There is no subject more on our minds than the preservation of our environment, and the absolute necessity of waging an all-out war against the debauching of that environment. A booming economy and the "good life" will be no good at all if our air is too dirty to breathe, our water too polluted to use, our surroundings too noisy and our land too cluttered and littered to allow us to live decently.

One of the great bays of our state is already so badly polluted it is unsafe for many water sports — and yet every day some one hundred million gallons of human and industrial wastes are dumped into it. And, along the Santa Barbara coast, seeping oil continues to ruin the beauty and endanger wildlife — and it is nothing less than irresponsible demagoguery to pretend that the turn of a valve or a simple edict can resolve this tragedy. No one can be indifferent to the distress of those along that scenic coastline. It goes without saying that the oil pollution plaguing them will be cleaned up — and, that must be a permanent guaranty.

We stand ready to use the tough provisions of the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act if necessary, including the requirement that those who are responsible for oil spills are responsible for cleaning them up.

But, it is even more important to find a way to end the threat of such pollution. When the federal government began granting leases outside the three-mile limit — more than a year prior to the disaster off Santa Barbara — we urged that before either the federal government or the leasing companies took any profit, a percentage be set aside as insurance for the nearby coastal areas. *This proposal was ignored.*

When we learned that federal drilling regulations were only one-third as effective as those we insist on in California State leases, we urged the federal government to adopt our standards — and we offered to take over the policing of the federal leases. *This suggestion also was ignored.* There is general agreement that the oil spill of last year could not have taken place had the drilling been done under our state regulations and policing. The incumbent Secretary of the Interior adopted our standards almost immediately upon taking office.

POLICY ON SANTA BARBARA

We support the State Lands Commission ban on any *new* drilling on off-shore lands under state jurisdiction while we make certain that safety and containment devices are adequate to protect the public interest. We have urged the federal government to do the same.

We have already joined with local governments to force the revocation of recent federal drilling and platform permits pending public hearings.

And, while we continue to seek scientific information and opinion on the long-range answer, we cannot ignore the findings of the scientific panel chaired by Dr. Lee DuBridge that pumping should be accelerated to relieve pressure build-ups which cause seepage through the fractured and unstable channel bottom. The most recent oil spill would seem to lend support to the DuBridge theory, since it resulted *not* from drilling but from a four-day halt in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Environmental quality emphasized:

pumping; there is also the history of oil seeps in the Santa Barbara channel going back long before any drilling or pumping began.

The other part of this whole off-shore oil problem has to do with esthetics — the unsightliness of the drilling platforms. The new Secretary of the Interior has agreed to extend into federal waters the sanctuary boundaries we have established to ban drilling in areas of great scenic beauty. This had not been done before and as a result, the sanctuaries ended at the three-mile limit.

The *real* answer can come, of course, through technology — the development of submerged and unitized structures for drilling and subsequent pumping. We will be ready to move on this as soon as such installations can be certified as practical.

But, one thing is certain: the people of Santa Barbara, and all our coastal communities, have and will continue to have our help to solve this tragedy and to prevent future occurences.

AIR POLLUTION

Back in the forties, smog was something radio comedians joked about; now, it is hard to find any humor in the some 13,000 tons of air pollutants descending every day on the inhabitants of just one of our metropolitan areas.

We have already made some progress in fighting air pollution — although it's hard to believe when the skyline dims and the air we breathe is made visible by the pollutants it contains. But, we did turn the tide in 1966, and despite the increased number of cars on our streets, air pollution is on the decline. Our job now is to speed that decline.

Last year, together we passed the toughest water quality control laws in the nation. We must have the same kind of tough laws to protect us from air pollution. Our state laws governing motor vehicle emissions are the toughest in the country, but they must be made even tougher.

We must seriously consider whether propulsion systems other than the internal combustion engine are practical, and we will continue our tests in this field. In the meantime, the stringent vehicle emission standards we have established must be enforced and the Air Resources Board is developing more effective emission test techniques so that *every* new vehicle can be checked before certification and sale.

And, we must move quickly against those *stationary* sources which continue to spew debris into our skies.

During this session I will seek your support for the passage of an Omnibus Clean Air Law. It would establish a statewide, comprehensive monitoring and control program; require compliance with even stiffer motor vehicle emission standards; include new standards for the composition and volatility of gasoline, and set forth a regulatory program for agricultural and other open burning.

There are some other key environmental goals which we shoud achieve this year:

- The preservation of our relatively few estuaries, particularly in Southern California;
- Opening up more of our coastal areas and beaches to public use;
- Initiating a broad program of conservation education in our schools;
- Encouraging the further preservation and enhancement of the San Francisco Bay;
- Encouraging the preservation of the natural environment of the Tahoe Basin, and
- Instituting stricter pesticide controls.

As a partner in government, I applaud the proposal for an Environmental Committee in the Assembly; recently a State Environmental Policy Council was formed in the executive branch. Lieutenant Governor Ed Reinecke is the chairman of that council which is now reviewing the many suggestions emanating from the recent Conference on Changing Environment. Some of those suggestions came from young people who represented college campuses throughout the state.

But, in seeking to preserve the magic of California, we must avoid those extremes on either end which could destroy our state. We cannot go all the way with those who cry, "No more roads, or factories, or power plants." Neither can we go all the way with those who justify everything in the name of progress — refusing to count the consequences; the obvious destruction of our environment is far too great a price to pay.

Progress and preservation are compatible; it is the refusal to work together for the proper balance that is incompatible with the spirit of the seventies. We must be concerned about the quality of our environment; we must also be concerned with the quality of government, and the integrity of those who serve in it.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Last year you passed and I signed a conflict-of-interest law, which, while it was a start in the right direction, failed to give us what we really need to assure our fellow citizens that government in California will be beholden to the people. Therefore this year, in cooperation with the leadership of both houses, I will again propose conflict-of-interest legislation which will give California *the most comprehensive laws of any state.*

This legislation will extend disclosure provisions to cover all state civil service employees as well as all elective and appointive officials, including all constitutional officers, all salaried appointive officers, all judges, and the immediate families of each. It will also cover local public officials — mayors, city councilmen, county supervisors, and the officials of boards and commissions.

Under the provisions of the law, all state civil servants and non-salaried appointive officials — and their immediate families — would be required to disclose only those investments in activities directly regulated by the agency, department or board of which the person was an employee or member.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

Just as we protect the public from the possibility of an unscrupulous public servant, so we must also protect the consumer from the possibility of the unscrupulous entrepreneur. We shall accelerate the programs in the area of consumer protection.

We will submit to you a reorganization proposal which would create within state government a Department of Consumer Affairs — the first of its kind in the nation. We will also move on several other administrative fronts.

We will again this year recommend that public membership be increased on many of the state's regulatory boards and commissions, and I hope that together we can do this to give the people a greater direct voice in the regulatory process.

We operate on the free competitive enterprise system in this nation and it has served America well. Business must, and generally does, serve the people honestly and fairly. We must be careful that we do not penalize or harass the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Together leave an imprint on all time"

multitude of honest businessmen for the sins of a few; those few must be brought into line, or put out of operation.

In the final analysis, the best protection for the consumer is to be fully armed with the facts about fair value, full measure, and safety. An important part of our consumer protection program will be to develop consumer education courses in our schools in cooperation with the Department of Education.

DRUG ABUSE AND NARCOTICS

We enter the seventies with a continuing and tremendous concern about the increasing problem of drug abuse and narcotics addiction. The problem has *not* been exaggerated; it is, in fact, more serious than appears in the news media. The physical and mental destruction of youth is far greater than the public is led to believe. Just as alarming is the growth of the "drug culture" which is tolerated — even touted — by many who influence our youth; it is a culture which glorifies and justifies the drugged and the drop-out, and it reaches into our high schools and even our junior high schools; the suburbs as well as the slums.

Together we have already taken significant legislative and administrative steps to wage a war against the peddler and the pusher, and to help those who are desperately trying to free themselves from their drug-induced nightmares. Working with the private sector, we have already embarked upon a widescale public education campaign to bring the facts of the horrors of drug abuse to our young people.

We will create a State Office of Narcotics and Drug Abuse Coordination. All agencies and departments in state government will be instructed to cooperate with this office in the total fight against narcotics and dangerous drugs. This is a war we intend to escalate, and win.

The laws we seek will involve the manufacture and sale of dangerous drugs, including licensing and bonding shippers and warehouses, expanding the duties and the powers of the State Board of Pharmacy, making the penalties for the sale or manufacture of restricted and dangerous drugs consistent with the penalties for possession of such drugs, and using electronic surveillance equipment under proper judicial safeguards.

We must all be deeply concerned about what J. Edgar Hoover called the "wretched record of crime and violence during the sixties." Law enforcement, on the whole, has done an excellent job in spite of increasing demands and obstacles. Perhaps the thrust in the seventies should be on the correctional system; it is the repeating offender who causes the bulk of our problems. There must be a new strategy in the search for answers. I propose an immediate major in-depth study of all correctional processes in California and will make the details of this proposal available to you shortly.

WELFARE

Even in these times of high employment, welfare costs in California continue to climb at a rate beyond the capacity of our tax structure to keep pace. *This increase each year is almost three times as great as the increase in our revenues.* During a period when we added 600,000 to our population, 400,000 were added to the welfare rolls.

We can, and we are reducing the administrative costs of welfare, and we are eliminating welfare fraud which not only robs the taxpayer but victimizes the legitimate welfare recipient. But this is not enough. We must be permitted to develop and implement a new approach — for welfare's purpose should be to eliminate, as far as possible, the need for its own existence.

The newly-created Department of Human Resources Development is a good start in that direction. Its goal is rehabilitation, and the transfer of the rehabilitated from the welfare rolls to payrolls. Later in this session I will make a special message to you on welfare, including the findings of an independent fraud review panel.

And, I will propose the organization of a new, streamlined Department of Health so that we can more effectively administer and control the Medi-Cal program, which, like welfare, is one of the major and fastest-rising costs of state government.

We must have the courage to face up to some hard decisions. There is just so much money in the government pot and it can only be spent once. It is our responsibility to establish priorities so that our limited funds can be put to the best possible use. How much, for example, should be spent on welfare as compared to education? We know that education offers the greatest opportunity for breaking the welfare cycle, yet the increase each year in welfare costs is almost double the increase we are able to give our schools.

EDUCATION

Education is still the high priority. Last year the commission I appointed on Educational reform completed the first phase of its work and made certain recommendations to me. These will be translated into concrete programs and legislation with reference to such important areas as teacher training, technical or vocational education, improved governance of the public education system, and education finance.

As long as school financing comes almost solely from the accidental method of property taxation, primary and secondary education will continue to experience serious fiscal difficulties and serious inequities between school districts. We must enact new ways to help finance schools and at the same time provide relief from the far-too-heavy property tax burden. During this session we must enact a tax reform package that will get that job done. Meanwhile, Californians should be leery of pseudo-tax reform measures which could well cost them one billion dollars a year in increased taxes.

The task in higher education poses as great a challenge and is as great an imperative. We must achieve a greater measure of accountability from these public institutions. We must achieve greater effectiveness in the management and priority of expenditures. Colleges must make full utilization of existing facilities and faculty before the taxpayer is asked to foot the bill for expansion.

Faculty members and administrators must continually remind themselves — or be reminded — that their fundamental purpose is to provide the conditions for effective learning, and to give the students the *first* priority. The student must not be forgotten in the competition for the academic establishment's drive for prestige and power.

The tone and the spirit of the 70s must be on quality rather than quantity. Education must be adequately financed; but we must not judge excellence solely in terms of dollars spent. The true measure is achievement of the students — in the trades, the technical skills, the professions, the arts . . . and in the progress made by each as an individual.

ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT

There is another area I must emphasize as we enter the seventies: that is the need — *the abosolute necessity* — to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Governor lists imperatives for 1970's

hold down the cost of government. I'm sure you expected me to get around to that.

It is a harsh fact of life — upon which most economists and historians agree — that once the level of taxation reaches and remains at 35 percent of the national income for a period of time, that nation cannot remain solvent — or free. Today, in our nation, the level of confiscation by taxation has reached approximately 37 percent — 37 cents out of each dollar earned is taken to pay the cost of government.

In a few weeks the budget for the fiscal year beginning next July will be submitted to you. I'll resist the temptation to find some adjectives to apply as a title to this budget; to tell you the truth, I don't think an adequate word has yet been coined.

Very simply, no area of government will receive all it asked for; unlike the federal government, we can't print money, and the State Constitution says we cannot spend beyond our revenues. So, taking the estimated total to be collected in taxes (and, for more than two decades those estimates have averaged within 1½ percent of being correct), we have distributed these revenues in the most part in proportions similar to the budget of last year. However, we asked each department to submit its own priorities in order of importance and the final decisions had to be made then on a comparison of some lower priority items of one department against another.

There may be difference of opinion regarding priorities — and this is certainly an area for a legitimate debate; but, the budget as a whole is up to the limit of estimated revenues. Anyone suggesting additions should be prepared to recommend an additional tax to pay for them. Frankly, I hope no one will. Government, as well as the individual, must share the pain of inflation.

Bastiat said, "The state is the great fictitious entity by which each one is led to believe he can exist at the expense of someone else." It's time to recognize we are all that "someone else." The individual's earnings which are taken for taxes — directly or indirectly — cannot be spent for food, or clothes, or education, or retirement savings. Money taken by government cannot be used to provide jobs or higher wages for a growing labor force.

"THE ARROGANCE OF OFFICIALDOM"

And, that brings me to another "must" — the need to bring government to *heel;* to make it not only more economical, but also more responsibe, so that the individual citizen can once again exercise control over the affairs of state.

By now we should have learned our lesson: the more government does for the people, the more it does *to* them, and then follows what Cicero called "the arrogance of officialdom." Those who want to give the citizens more and more government usually end up giving them just that — and little else. Our task for the seventies is not more government, *but better government.*

At the beginning of the last decade, a young leader stood on the steps of the nation's Capitol and exhorted America: "Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country." His challenge struck a chord in our hearts. Now, on the threshold of a new decade, we might well add: "Ask what we can do for ourselves," ask "what we can do to solve the problems of human misery without waiting for yet another government program."

Now, I know that this will fall harshly on the ears of those who say that government and government spending is the only answer to our problems. But the great social ills are with us not because of indifference or lack of government effort — on the contrary there have been massive and costly welfare programs. Too often government is an unwarranted and an unwanted middle-man who becomes a part of the problem — and in the government's war against poverty, for example, poverty is winning. On the other hand, in the war that the private sector is waging against poverty, hundreds of thousands of individuals not only have new jobs and an income — they have a new sense of individual pride.

The question is not whether the unfortunate should, or should not be cared for; the real question is "How can we *best* care for them, at the same time that we help those who can help themselves."

SPIRIT OF THE '70's

Today, many of our young people are critical of what they call "The Establishment." Frankly, I think they have much to be critical about. There is a certain validity to many of the points they raise; there is a certain legitimacy about many of the grievances they list. But, in their impatience and their exuberance to build a better world, they have at times been misled to premature or excessive action by those who took advantage of their concern. But now they are wiser to the ways of the zealots, including some of their own teachers, who used them for non-constructive purposes.

Many of our young people talk about greater participation in our American democracy, and when asked about their plans for the future, they say they want to serve — to become, as they put it, "meaningfully involved."

Well, meaningful involvement is the very heart of the Creative Society. It's exactly what we mean when we say that government once again should be of and by — as well as for — the people; that no government and no government program can ever do away with the need for individual participation. And if the young people are really looking for action — constructive action which can make the decade of the seventies a benchmark in man's search for a better world — they can find it by working within the system, reforming it, making it more responsive to the citizenry, and helping to get it out of our pockets and off our backs.

Some of our young people have said that what they are really looking for, what they are working for, is a return to the original purpose and the original spirit of America; the spirit which seems to them to have been pushed aside in this centralized, computerized, contemporary world. Well, that spirit may be lost, but it hasn't died. Has democracy failed in America — or, has it ever really been tried? That idea that all men were created equal; that each man should be free to fly as high as his ability and his drive will take him; that each man counts and is accountable, beholden only to God for his sovereign rights.

Just past the mid-way point in this new decade we will observe the 200th anniversary of the founding of this nation. Dare we imagine what the 1970s could be if the spirit of those first American seventies — the 1770s — could be reawakened in our land? Dare we envision what heights we could reach if that spirit became the spirit of the 1970s?

More than a footprint on the moon — as great as that is — we could together leave an imprint on all time, and we could reaffirm the true yardstick by which to judge the state of the State for decades to come.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Two New Departments Proposed

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR

Reorganization plans which create a new Department of Consumer Affairs and a Department of Health were submitted to the state's "Little Hoover" Commission for review. The Commission's recommendations to the Legislature are the initial steps in approving executive reorganization plans which automatically become effective unless the Legislature takes action to refer them for further study. The Governor's reorganization authority is derived from a constitutional change approved as part of the 1966 Constitution revision and is similar to authority delegated to the President by Congress.

Reagan's Department of Consumer Affairs is essentially a renaming of the existing Department of Professional and Vocational Standards. The renaming is intended to help citizens with complaints find where to take them. The plan also adds more public members to the various regulating and licensing boards within the Department and consolidates investigative units, but no increase in functions is planned for the renamed department. Democratic Leader Jess Unruh bluntly commented, "The Governor wants to hoodwink the people of this state into thinking they have a genuine department of consumer affairs. If a name change is all that is contemplated, I think it is a mockery indeed on the idea of consumer protection."

The new Department of Health constitutes a substantial restructuring of the existing Department of Mental Hygiene, Department of Public Health, and Department of Health Care Services into a single department. The new agency would also house substantial components of the Social Welfare and Rehabilitation Departments and the various healing arts boards currently under the Department of Professional and Vocational Statndards.

Governor Reagan said the reorganization is designed "to improve the quality, while holding down the costs of those health-related programs which are administered or supervised by the state." If the plan takes effect, the new department would become operative July 1, 1971.

FINANCE

Verne Orr, formerly director of Motor Vehicles occupies the post recently vacated by Caspar Weinberger, who left the Reagan administration, and the increasingly tough budget balancing problems of the state, to become Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission. New Finance director Orr, taking over late in the budget preparation cycle, has taken responsibility for overcoming what has been estimated to be a gap of as much as $167 million between expected revenues and expenditures for 1970-71, in order to comply with the State Constitutional requirement that the Governor present a balanced budget to the Legislature. Details of the Administration budget proposal will be submitted to the Legislature on February 3.

EDUCATION

The retirement of three members of the State Board of Education was the occasion for verbal fireworks at the two-day board meeting held in Los Angeles in January. Dorman Commons, an oil executive and board member since 1962, charged State Superintendent of Public Instruction Max Rafferty with "negligence and incompetence," charging that Rafferty has been "disruptive rather than constructive" and that he has used his nonpartisan job for personal political gain and that "instead of solutions he has offered rhetorical irrelevancies." Rafferty, who is up for reelection this year, was defended by board member Eugene Ragle who accused Commons of forcing his venal, partisan political views on the public." Observers say that Ragle may seek election as president of the board at next month's meeting.

WELFARE

Newly appointed Social Welfare Director Robert Martin announced that welfare fraud exists in almost 16 percent of all cases of public assistance to needy families according to the findings of a fraud review panel. The report which indicated that welfare fraud amounted to about $59 million in 1969 was made public shortly after Assembly Public Health Committee chairman Gordon Duffy, a Republican, reported that 500,000 California children are threatened by malnutrition, partially because aid to families with dependent children is not adequate. Reconciling the findings of the two reports will be a central issue in the setting of welfare policy for 1970.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

A 3-2 decision by the Public Utilities Commission to regard Pacific Telephone's source of equipment, Western Electric Co., as a manufacturer and not as a utility in consideration of the rate of return has offered an obvious justification for a rate increase. Retiring commission member A. W. Gatov, the last remaining appointee of former Governor Edmund Brown, issued a strong dissent to the majority decision and predicted a $200 million rate increase application will be forthcoming.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BENCH & BAR

NEW COURT JUSTICE

Roger Traynor, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court since 1964 and a Justice since 1940 stepped down on January 31 from the highest judicial post in the State.

Associate Justice Louis H. Burke, 65, is, despite his age, a leading contender for the nomination to serve out the remaining five years of Traynor's term. The nomination is subject to confirmation by the Commission on Judicial Appointments made up of the Attorney General and the senior presiding appellate court justice.

BURKE. One of the two Republican justices on the Court, Burke is highly respected for his analytical ability and integrity. His nationwide reputation for judicial administration brought him under consideration by President Nixon to fill the U.S. Chief Justice vacancy. It was this possibility which delayed Governor Reagan's announcement.

The appointment of a successor to Traynor is a key decision for Reagan, though in the short run it will not alter significantly the liberal-conservative balance on the seven-man court. Four Democrats remain to make up a majority.

PHILOSOPHY. It is inaccurate to categorize the political philosophy of a justice, though some have labeled Burke as a moderate conservative. Often in recent years, Burke has been in a dissenting minority of two with fellow-Republican, Marshall F. McComb. But in some important decisions Burke did not fit a conservative pattern.

Also rumored for the post were Spencer Williams, former Secretary for Human Relations, who subsequently announced his candidacy for Attorney General, and Associate Justice Marshall F. McComb, who is a long-time friend of the Governor's.

DUTIES. The duties of the chief justice include presiding over the Judicial Council which is responsible for adopting rules for administration and practice in state courts, balancing court workload statewide, and improving the administration of justice. He is also chairman of the Commission on Judicial Appointments responsible for confirming or rejecting nominees or appointees to vacancies on the state's courts.

The duties of the chief justice also include presiding over conferences discussing pending cases, assigning the writing of opinions, participating as an equal member of the court in deciding cases, and administering the court's business.

In retiring just before his 70th birthday, Traynor bowed to the provisions of a retirement system which will pay him 75 percent of his $43,269 per year salary but only fifty percent if he had continued to work.

PEOPLE IN THE NEWS

APPOINTED

Earl W. Brian, Jr., 28, as Director of the Department of Health Care Services effective April 1. Brian replaces Carel W. Mulder who is becoming a private health care consultant after serving the Reagan administration since January 1967. Brian previously served as executive secretary of the State Welfare Board before entering the army. He received his MD degree from Duke University.

Robert Cozens, as Director of the Department of Motor Vehicles to succeed Verne Orr. Cozens resigned his post as supervisor from San Diego County to join the Reagan administration.

Charles E. Dixon, 46, as Director of General Services, the state's housekeeping agency. Dixon replaces Verne Orr, the new finance director. Some observers expected Dixon, who served for one year as deputy finance director under Caspar Weinberger, to get the finance post.

James M. Hall, 35, as Secretary of Business and Transportation to succeed Gordon Luce who resigned to become president of the San Diego Federal Savings and Loan Association. Hall, a native of San Diego, leaves the post of Superintendent of Banks.

Bob Martin, as Director of the Department of Social welfare to fill the position left vacant by the departure of former director John C. Montgomery who joined the Nixon administration.

Verne Orr, as Director of Finance (see Executive Departments, page 19).

James R. Schoning, 27, as Chief Administrative Officer of the Assembly, the principal staff position of the Rules Committee. Schoning replaces V.G. "Chip" Nielsen, now staff assistant to Lt. Governor Ed Reinecke. He previously served as a member of the Coro Foundation staff in Los Angeles.

Lucian B. Vandergrift, 43, as Secretary for Human Relations to succeed Spencer Williams who resigned to campaign for Attorney General. Vandergrift, a former Butte County district attorney, has been assistant human relations secretary since May 1968.

DIED

Glen Lipscomb, 54, ranking Republican on the House Committee on Defense Appropriations. Lipscomb was first elected to Congress in 1953 after serving eight years in the California Assembly.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FACT SHEET

Legislative Reorganization Proposed

On the second day of the 1970 legislative session Assembly Speaker Bob Monagan proposed a major restructuring of legislative sessions and procedure. The reorganization would convert the Legislature from annual sessions to a continuous body which meets "when necessary to conduct business" during the period between general elections. If the Monagan plan, which has the support of Senate President pro Tem Howard Way, is approved by the requisite two-thirds of each house of the Legislature and a majority of the electorate, the next Legislature will convent on December 7, 1970, and meet on a continuous basis until it is constitutionally adjourned on November 30, 1972.

The proposed reorganization was formulated by a bi-partisan select committee appointed in the Assembly early last year to review the entire legislative structure. The committee, working with a professional consulting firm, recommended several major changes in legislative procedure in a report released by its chairman, Majority Floor Leader Craig Biddle. The specific constitutional changes which the committee proposed (and which are incorporated in ACA 2) are:

> Provide that the Legislature convene on the first Monday of December of each even-numbered year as a continuous body until it adjourns on November 30 of the following even-numbered year.
>
> Change the terms of Members to begin on the first Monday of December following elections.
>
> Provide that statutes ordinarily take effect on the first day of January.
>
> Provide that each House and its committees conduct open meetings as provided by Statute.

The end-of-session logjam, innumerable scheduling conflicts and inadequate time for "interim" study were pointed to by the Biddle committee (Assemblymen Ray E. Johnson and Joe A. Gonsalves were the other members of the committee) as justification for the change: "The Legislature must be permitted to schedule sessions of the two houses in accord with actual workload and not be confined by constitutional strictures which, at best, hamper such scheduling and often require unnecessary floor sessions when time should be devoted to the business of standing and investigative committees."

CONSTITUTION REVISION COMMISSION

Monagan told the Constitution Revision Commission at its January 15 meeting in San Jose that the proposal is consistent with the step taken four years ago following recommendations by the commission which appeared on the ballot as Proposition 1-A and provided for annual sessions and year-round service. "Now, after three complete sessions under the new organization, we feel the Legislature is ready to advance a step further. The finest legislative machinery in the nation, which we rightly claim here in California, is of little use if it is prevented from operating at its full potential. Our excellent research apparatus, our legislative counsel, our committee structure and consulting staff are hampered in fulfilling their tasks by unnecessary duplication of effort, by an uneven distribution of effort, by an uneven distribution of the workload throughout the year, and by artificial barriers and deadlines."

Monagan asked the commission for an immediate recommendation so that the proposal can be placed on the June primary ballot. "If for any reason we cannot obtain voter approval this year, it will be 1973 before biennial sessions are a reality. We do not feel it is in the people's interest to delay this constructive change." The response by commission members was generally considered to be favorable, and an endorsement is expected at the next meeting, which chairman Bruce Sumner indicated would be devoted to study of the plan.

TWO-YEAR SESSION

The most significant of the changes in the Constitution is the elimination of the practice of holding annual sessions which require an Assemblyman during his two-year term to participate in two separate sessions. Although these sessions are not subject to constitutional limitations as to length, practical deadlines imposed by such procedural requirements as the effective date of bills and the veto session limit the time available to complete the entire process in one year. Biennial sessions would spread this workload over two years, giving committees a period of 21 instead of eight months to complete consideration of bills. Prior to 1966 the interim period between the regular every-other-year sessions offered a useful period for investigative studies and hearings by committees; annual sessions effectively eliminated this time period. The ability to recess formal sessions as workload permits, plus elimination of the veto session, is expected to give committees more time, as bills will not have to be rushed to the floor to meet an adjournment deadline.

EARLIER STARTING TIME

Making the first Monday of December following the General election starting date of both session and the terms of Members shortens the current lame duck period, but more importantly takes into account the inertia of the first 30 days of a legislative session.

This organizational period is limited principally to housekeeping chores until committee assignments are made,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Prospective two-year sessions

with no bills eligible for hearing, under the 30-day constitutional lapse between bill introduction and hearing. Under the present system January is the "organizational" month; the reorganization proposal would move this forward one month to December and it would occur only once during the biennial session. This change would also serve to make more time available for the process of legislating.

One revision which makes the new approach to scheduling possible is the change in effective date of legislation. Currently the effective date is 60 days after adjournment of a regular session (or 90 days after a special session). Under the proposed reorganization the Legislature does not adjourn each year — thus requiring a new method of determining the effective date. The proposal makes January 1 a uniform effective date each year and requires bills to be passed 90 days in advance of that date, to retain the current "referendum" period between enactment of a law and its effective date. Bills passed later would wait until the following January unless they are urgency measures enacted by a two-thirds vote of both Houses.

OPEN MEETINGS

ACA 2 also proposes a change in the existing constitutional language permitting the Legislature to conduct closed meetings, replacing it with a broad statement of the principle that sessions and committee meetings should be open to the press and public, leaving the specific provisions to be written into law.

Agreement on the statutory provisions may not be easy. During the 1969 session Assemblyman Bill Ketchum authored a constitutional amendment to make the Legislature subject to an open meeting requirement similar to the state law applicable to agencies of local government since 1953. The Ketchum proposal had substantial newspaper support but was defeated following an acrimonious hearing before the Assembly Government Administration Committee chaired by Assemblyman Carl Britschgi. Monagan indicated he did not support the proposal, and some observers felt his position was in part an attempt to remain neutral in the leadership fight then underway in the Senate. (One of the issues raised in the challenge to then President pro Tem Hugh Burns' leadership was the secret meetings regularly held by the powerful Senate Government Efficiency Committee.) The recognition of the open meeting requirement embodied in Monagan's constitutional amendment required specific legislative enactment to give it effect. The position the Speaker takes in spelling out the conditions under which the Legislature will conduct its meetings may be one of the key issues in determining public and press reaction to the proposition when it goes on the ballot. In order to place the legislative reorganization package on the June ballot legislative action must be completed by the end of February, and getting ACA 2 through the houses in one month may not be feasible.

Monagan and Way are currently considering the creation of a joint committee to plan for implementation of the constitutional changes and to consider other re-organizational changes contained in the consultants' report.

REORGANIZATION GOALS

The proposed constitutional amendment leaves many procedural issues to be specified by law. It is expected that the bill to effect the biennial session would specify the method of scheduling sessions, recesses and convening on extraordinary occasions. Also to be resolved by statutory enactment is the manner of considering gubernatorial vetoes.

Staff work is already underway on the legislation necessary to amend those sections of the Government Code relating to the legislature to bring them into conformity, provide for a specific schedule for a two-year session, and spell out the open meeting requirement. The bill must be enacted this year so that it can provide for the transition to the two-year session which would begin this December.

OTHER REFORM PROPOSALS

Democratic Assemblyman John Dunlap introduced a constitutional amendment (ACA 5) to permit pre-filing of legislation between December 1 and the start of each regular session. Although current rules permit pre-prints of bills, the Constitution requires a 30-day waiting period from the time a bill is introduced until it can be heard by a committee. The period does not begin when pre-print bills are filed and they must be reintroduced when the session convenes. Under the Dunlap proposal the 30-day period would start running from the time the bill is filed, in advance of the Session convening date. The same objective would be accomplished by Speaker Monagan's legislative reorganization.

A proposal that California switch to a one-house, or unicameral, legislature was advanced by Senator Lewis F. Sherman, Chairman of the Senate's new Government Organization Committee. The topic was debated in legislative halls and in the press for several years after Nebraska adopted unicameralism in 1934, but interest waned until the U.S. Supreme Court's historic Reynolds "one man-one vote" decision in 1964. Sherman admits his constitutional amendment has little chance of passage, however, and Senate President pro Tem Howard Way has indicated that he does not favor a unicameral legislature.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

POLITICAL ROUND-UP

Unruh launches Governor campaign

Text of announcement

Following is the complete text of Assembly Minority Leader Jesse Unruh's announcement of candidacy for Governor of California, December 4, 1969.

I announce today that I am a candidate for Governor of California. I do so with a deep sense of obligation to this state and her people for what they have done for me.

I hitch-hiked here from Texas nearly thirty years ago with little more than the clothes on my back. I found work in an aircraft plant, enlisted in the Naval Air Corps during World War II, and came home to California to complete my college education on the G.I. Bill of Rights.

After two defeats, I was elected to the State Legislature. I have served fifteen years in state government — half of that time as Speaker of the Assembly.

California has kept the promise it held for me.

I run for Governor because I want to keep the promise of California alive and growing for everyone. We are told today that idealism and vision and hope are obsolete — that all we can do as a people is drag along — that we cannot afford new opportunities for our young people or a second chance for those who need it. We are told that the promise of California must now be an empty one.

That is not acceptable.

OBJECTIVES

I believe that we can provide each of our children with all the education he can use, not just what he can afford.

I believe we can preserve and protect our great natural beauties and resources and cleanse the air we breathe.

I believe we can do better by middle income Californians than to confiscate their homes by even higher property taxation.

And I believe that we can be secure on the city streets and in our homes.

To do these things requires calm and concerned leadership. We must first have a Governor who cares and who wants to put things together — not tear our people apart.

I believe I can be that kind of Governor.

NEEDS HELP

But no one can govern this big state alone. I will need the help of every one of you — and I ask your help, all of you — housewife, businessman, public employee, private wage earner, teacher, student and pensioner.

Because the handful of half-hidden millionaires who call the shots in Sacramento today do not represent California. They must be told that it is *your* state and *your* future. We will say to them, "No, you can not buy our government like you bought a mansion for Ronald Reagan."

So today I ask you to join in this campaign — to return California to its people. I need your ideas, your energy, and your trust.

And as we go forward we will make this great state truly the laboratory for the future. We will find the exciting, effective answers to our problems. We will do it together. And together we can control our destiny and shape our future.

We already have the talent and resources for greatness. With your help and God willing, we shall find the courage.

Unruh '70's action plan

Gubernatorial candidate Jess Unruh on January 5, issued "Action Plan for the 1970's," in effect, his campaign platform and State-of-the-State message. Following is a summary:

EDUCATION. Unruh called for an overhaul of the present school financing system; equalizing the funds available for rich and poor districts and increasing the State share of school support. Urging increased emphasis on results rather than methodology, Unruh suggested the possibility of contracting with business, with payment being contingent upon achieving results.

In higher education Unruh wants spelled out in law the State's commitment that "no qualified student will be denied admission to the University or State Colleges."

TAXATION. In the area of taxation, Unruh supports a property tax ceiling, reduced reliance upon property taxation to finance education, and "comprehensive tax reform assuring that each taxpayer carries his fair share of the burden." Such reform includes withholding of personal income taxes, the closing of loopholes, including the oil depletion allowance and the property tax exemption on insurance company home offices, and the imposition of "a minimum tax on all economic income regardless of whether it is protected by special exemptions or deductions."

CRIME. In order to cut crime, Unruh called for "a massive commitment to support and improve our police forces" through a state-financed Police Education Program.

ENVIRONMENT. Toward achieving improved environmental quality, Unruh proposed the enactment of legislation "to stop the drilling in the Santa Barbara Channel and to make the oil companies liable for the damage caused by the leaking oil." Also proposed was a reduction of the number of representatives of entities which are now or may be potential polluters to less than 50% on local water quality control boards.

Automobile "emission standards twice as strict as those in the [present] law would be possible in 1975. Those new strict standards should be made part of the law forthwith." Laws should "require that automobile manufacturers be responsible for disposing of abandoned cars which they originally produced."

Unruh urged action now to complete the comprehensive California development and land use plan which has been in progress for four years, and a State Conservation Authority should be created to plan and guide programs which affect the environment.

CONFLICT. Unruh supported efforts to strengthen the state's conflict of interest laws.

CONSUMERS. Unruh listed three proposals for consumer protection: empower the Insurance Commissioner "to review proposed [insurance] rate increases and deny them if facts indicate they are excessive;" strengthen the Consumer Counsel; and modify existing laws "so that consumers who have been defrauded will be encouraged to take legal action."

Unruh further proposed establishing a council of economic advisors to the Governor with full power to keep close tabs on the state's economy and recommend "whatever steps are necessary to prepare for the economic conditions they see coming."

"So it is in the spirit of the promise of the Seventies that I offer and will work for this program," Unruh concluded.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GOVERNMENT SEMINAR

Political Competition

Political competition, providing a choice between alternative policies, is a necessary and desirable characteristic of American democracy. Without competition the responsiveness of an elected representative to his constituents' demands may be diminished, and to that extent the people do not govern themselves.

Inquiries into the nature of political competition have pointed out that there is often a lack of competition between political parties. Perhaps half of the congressional districts in the United States are non-competitive, one-party districts. While this information is both important and useful, it is only half of the story. These studies of the amount of competition that exists between *parties* do not measure the degree of competition between *incumbent and candidate.* The degree of competition in a system can only be realistically understood in terms of the likelihood that a candidate will defeat an incumbent, and an examination of incumbent-safety, (or the extent of entrenched incumbency), rather than party-safety, is crucial to an accurate understanding of congressional competition.

A Republican candidate can surely win election, and then re-election, in a district previously considered safely Democratic. Republican Congressman Jerry Pettis, for instance, the Representative from the 33rd California Congressional District, has been elected to the House twice from a district that was represented by a strong Democratic incumbent, Harry Sheppard, for over 14 years.[1]

Steven Merksamer is Administrative Assistant to Lieutenant Governor Ed Reinecke. Merksamer's articles have appeared in several political journals including Western Politica.

When the incumbent could no longer run for re-election, the district, as Pettis demonstrated, could no longer be considered safely Democratic. In other words, it is important to remember that congressional districts are not necessarily safe for a Republican or a Democrat *per se,* but for an incumbent who happens to be either a Republican or a Democrat.

We can now begin our inquiry into the extent of political competition within the California congressional delegation.

THE SAFE INCUMBENT

An analysis of the last 20 years of California congressional election history leads to some interesting, even striking, conclusions.

Although California politics have acquired a conspicuous reputation for turbulence and heightened unpredictability, the record of 306 congressional elections indicates a rather unexpected stability. Within the period 1948-1968 for instance, there were only 15 incumbents out of a total of 288 candidates running for Congress with incumbent status, who were defeated in their general election bids. Thus, 95 per cent of California's congressional incumbents who sought re-election were returned to office. A similar study of the re-election record of incumbent office-holders throughout the nation revealed that 90 per cent of those who ran for re-election were successful. The degree of incumbent-safety is high nationally. That it is still higher in California is a most unexpected finding.[2]

Of the fifteen defeated California incumbents, nine were only one-term incumbents (See Table I). Only one defeated incumbent, Frank Havenner, the Democratic Representative of the Fourth Congressional District, had served for more than 3 terms in the same congressional district. Moreover, only 3 incumbents, Havenner, Oakley Hunter and Harlan Hagan had received over 60 per cent of the vote in the election preceding their defeat.

The other 12 incumbents received under 60 per cent of the vote in their last successful bids for re-election. Over 57 per cent of the 15 defeated incumbents garnered less than 55 per cent of the vote in their final election preceding their defeat. Significantly, the three incumbents, Havenner, Hunter and Hagan, received less than 60 per cent of the vote in the second election preceding their defeat.

DEFINITION

In 20 years of California congressional election history, no incumbent receiving over 60 per cent of the vote in two consecutive elections has been defeated in the following election. *A California incumbent,* therefore, *is safe for a particular election if he has received over 60 per cent of the vote in at least two preceding elections.* Applying this definition to the California Congressional Delegation for the upcoming election, *twenty-one incumbents — over 50 per cent of the California delegation — may be regarded as virtually unbeatable in 1970* (see Chart).

All but one of the safe California incumbents have been elected for more than three full terms. With this information, and the knowledge that most of those incumbents defeated in the last two decades had served only one term, it can be logically asserted that the longer an incumbent is re-elected to Congress, the safer an incumbent becomes. Thus, it appears that the degree of competition for California's congressional seats is starkly limited.

PRIMARY COMPETITION

Some astute and responsible political scientists have implied that in districts where one party is dominant, the primary election allows for the competitive politics lacking in the general election. In California, no incumbent, regardless of whether he could have been classified as safe or unsafe, has been defeated in a California primary in the last 20 years, and the California incumbents considered safe in the general election seem especially secure in their primaries.

The only exception to the rule that the California safe incumbent runs better in the primary than he does in the general was Jeffrey Cohelan, a seven-term Demo-

[1] Sheppard had received over 60 per cent of the vote in every election from 1954. Nineteen sixty-two was Sheppard's final election to Congress.

[2] While in the United States the median incumbent congressman running for re-election in 1960 ran about 4 percentage points ahead of his party's presidential candidate, in California the median incumbent congressman ran about 8 percentage points ahead of his party's presidential candidate.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and Congressional Incumbency

crat who encountered remarkably strong opposition in 1966. Yet the Cohelan campaign was exceptional, not only because Congressman Cohelan received a smaller percentage of the vote in the primary than he did in the general, but also because the campaign of Robert Scheer, his opponent, was directed at least as much against the American presence in Vietnam as it was against Cohelan.[3]

All the California incumbents classified as safe for 1970, however, polled a substantially higher percentage of the vote in the primary than they did in the general election of the same year. It can be stated with certitude, therefore, that the safe California incumbent is even more secure in the primary than he is in the general election. In California, at least, the notion that primary competition tends to substitute for general election competition does not hold.

CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT	SAFE INCUMBENT	Percent of Vote 1968	Percent of Vote 1966	Percent of Vote 1964
1	Don Clausen (R)	75.2	64.8	59.0
2	Harold T. Johnson (D)	60.7	70.9	64.5
5	Phillip Burton (D)	72.7	71.3	100.0
6	William S. Maillard (R)	73.3	76.6	63.6
7	Jeffery Cohelan (D)	62.8	64.4	66.1
8	George P. Miller (D)	64.0	65.4	70.3
10	Charles S. Gubser (R)	67.2	69.1	63.1
12	Burt L. Talcott (R)	92.5	77.3	61.9
13	Charles Teague (R)	65.8	67.4	57.3
16	B.F. Sisk (D)	62.4	71.4	66.8
19	Chet Holifield (D)	63.0	62.3	65.4
20	H. Allen Smith (R)	69.3	73.4	67.9
21	Augustus Hawkins (D)	91.5	84.8	90.3
23	Del Clawson (R)	72.8	67.3	55.4
24	Glen Lipscomb (R)	72.8	76.3	67.9
26	Tom Rees (D)	65.4	62.3	59.4*
28	Alphonzo Bell (R)	71.2	72.3	65.6
30	Edward R. Roybal (D)	69.8	66.4	66.3
32	Craig Hosmer (R)	73.8	80.1	68.9
35	James B. Utt (R)	72.5	65.0	73.1
36	Bob Wilson (R)	71.6	72.7	59.0

*December 15, 1965 special election.

REAPPORTIONMENT

The record of incumbent victories, both in the general and the primary elections, is disturbing to those dissatisfied with their representative's performance in Washington. The incumbent enjoys too many advantages — competent and well-paid staff, the use of the frank, instantaneous press coverage for the most mundane of pronouncements — to be seriously challenged. Even congressional reapportionment, designed to make representation more equal, has served, in California at least, to limit further the already slim degree of political competition.

Out of 18 congressional incumbents classified as safe in 1968,[4] the 1967 California Reapportionment benefited 12 by increasing the registration of their particular party within their districts. Only four safe incumbents, Miller, Talcott, Lipscomb and Utt, witnessed a decrease in the percentage of district voters belonging to their particular political party. These decreases, however, were exceedingly insignificant, ranging from 0.7 percent to 1.4 per cent in districts where each of these incumbents had received over 65 per cent of the vote in the last election preceding reapportionment.

We see, therefore, that the amount of competition faced by incumbent congressmen in California is remarkably low. In terms of 20 years of election history, over 50 per cent of California's 38 congressional incumbents can not be defeated in their 1970 re-election bids. Nor can it be said that an incumbent classified as safe for a general election will encounter more rigorous opposition in his party's primary. Even congressional reapportionment tends to aid incumbents.

How, then, can safe incumbents be defeated?

The answer is that safe incumbents — most incumbents — *cannot* be defeated. Indeed, the logical question to be asked is not how one goes about defeating a safe incumbent, but rather, why do candidates challenge incumbents they have no chance of defeating?

If history is our guide, the reapportionment of 1970 will find only a few more than the state's 4 new congressional seats going to the majority party. And California's safe incumbents are not likely to be among those who will fail to return to Washington in January of 1972, regardless of which party draws the lines.

3 Republicans may conduct a similar contest in the 28th C.D. in 1970, where incumbent Alphonzo Bell will meet challenger John T. LaFollette.

4 Reapportionment figures for two of the safe incumbents, Congressmen Burton and Maillard, were not available.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

State-wide races are off to

The first election of each decade, the final plunge before the political impact of reapportionment, is always a heated one, and California politicians seem dedicated to making 1970 no exception.

Governor Ronald Reagan, despite one recent poll showing him leading his chief rival, Assembly Democratic Leader Jess Unruh, by only 4.3 percent among all Californians, is conceded to be an odds-on choice for re-election to a second term.

With the withdrawal of San Francisco Mayor Joseph Alioto, Unruh has received the endorsement of almost every major Democratic leader, including United States Senator Alan Cranston. Although veteran State Senator Randolph Collier, "the father of the freeways" and a recent loser in the internal wars of the Senate, has been mentioned as a challenger to Unruh, the more imposing threat will come from Mayor Sam Yorty of Los Angeles.

Although much of the Mayor's financial and organizational support would be expected to gravitate to the Governor by November, his hard-hitting campaign style and well-known name would force his sometime ally Unruh into a full-scale primary battle.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Former Democratic State Chairman Robert Coate, who was set to run Mayor Alioto's gubernatorial campaign, has announced for this race. State Senator Al Alquist of San Jose seems likely to compete to represent Northern California and balance the Democratic ticket as candidates for the job of Lieutenant Governor, now held by Governor Reagan's appointee, former Congressman Ed Reinecke.

The office of the Lieutenant Governorship, which has been increased in stature by the Reagan Administration since the departure of Robert Finch for Washington, continues to attract the interest of State Senate Minority Floor Leader George Moscone of San Francisco and Los Angeles investment realtor and a top advisor to Governor Brown, Milton Gordon, both Democrats. Los Angeles City Councilman Tom Bradley and School Board Member Julian Nava have declined to make the race. After a shakey start Reinecke has taken on new responsibilities with the backing of the Governor and is unopposed in the June primary.

ATTORNEY GENERAL

The retirement of Tom Lynch, the only statewide Democratic victor in 1966, has set the stage for what may be the most competitive race of the campaign.

Even before Lynch made his formal announcement, four serious Republican candidates declared their intentions. State Senators George Deukmejian of Long Beach and John Harmer of Glendale, former State Health and Welfare Agency Secretary, Spencer Williams, and Los Angeles County District Attorney Evelle Younger have all begun expensive and well-managed campaigns.

Younger, a consistent winner in his home county, has been a Superior Court judge, a city prosecutor and an F.B.I. agent. He has the credentials of a party moderate. A former Santa Clara County Counsel, Williams hopes that Northern California voters will favor him over his three southern rivals. The agency secretary lost his race with Lynch in 1966 by almost half a million votes, and, like Younger, has been mentioned as a candidate for several appointments to the Nixon administration.

Deukmejian is running a grass-roots effort, enlisting the support of local party leaders across the Republican spectrum. The Senate Majority Floor Leader will encounter strong opposition for the Southern California conservative vote from his colleague, Harmer, who has won strong support from that wing of his party since his upset victory over moderate Republican Assemblyman, Howard Thelin, in the 1966 senate primary race.

Despite the "11th Commandment" and the neutrality of Governor Reagan, one issue has arisen to separate the candidates. Williams has called Los Angeles the center of Mafia activity in California in a less-than-veiled criticism of his primary opponent Younger, as well as incumbent Lynch.

Chief Deputy Attorney-General Charles A. O'Brien, who has been Lynch's public spokesman since 1966, will inherit the credits and debits of his boss as the leading Democratic contender for the nomination. The San Francisco attorney, who has been Chief Deputy to Stanley Mosk and Executive Secretary to Governor Brown, may be opposed by William Bennett, former Public Utilities Commissioner and consumer advocate, who was defeated by Lynch in the 1966 primary. San Franciscan George T. Davis, who headed Harry Truman's presidential campaign in 1948, has also announced that he will be a candidate for the top law enforcement post.

SECRETARY OF STATE

The health of veteran Secretary of State, Frank M. Jordan, has raised serious doubts that he will be able to campaign for re-election. Santa Clara County Assemblyman George Milias, a well-known conservationist and student of election law, has announced he will be a candidate unless the Governor appoints someone else before the filing deadline. Rumors circulated in the Capitol several weeks ago that Fresno County Administrator Phillip V. Sanchez was in line for such an appointment; however, no action has yet been taken.

Assembly Speaker pro Tempore Charles Conrad of Sherman Oaks has withdrawn his name from consideration. Republican party conservatives who seek an alternative to Milias may now turn to Stanford track coach, Payton Jordan, in an attempt to continue the tradition of electing only "Jordans" to the job. This Jordan could expect to have the strong backing of the California Republican Assembly but would have to give up his important U.S. Olympic Committee position to run. Los Angeles Negro Attorney James Flournoy is also considering making the race for the GOP nomination.

The only Democratic candidate for the post currently being mentioned is Edmund G. (Jerry) Brown, Jr., 31, son of the former Governor and a member of the strife-torn Los Angeles Junior College Board. State Senator Alan Short has ended speculation that he might campaign for the post and will instead seek reelection to the Senate.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a fast start

Two Republican constitutional office holders seem to cause prospective Democratic opponents to tremble at the thought of challenging them. State Treasurer Ivy Baker Priest and Controller Houston I. Flournoy are thus far running completely unopposed. Only Milton Gordon (mentioned also for Lieutenant Governor) is considering a campaign for Treasurer against Mrs. Priest. Flournoy's independent stance on such issues as withholding of income tax, campus unrest, and internal reforms in the inheritance tax appraisal system have won him high marks from many Democrats.

SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Superintendent of Public Instruction Max Rafferty, with the withdrawal of Hayakawa, must anticipate the challenge from Wilson Riles, currently one of his top aides and a former director of the State Department of Education's Office of Compensatory Education. Riles, a Negro, had been prominently mentioned as a candidate for Commissioner of the Federal Office of Education under Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Robert Finch.

Another strong candidate is Los Angeles Board of Education member Julian Nava, a college professor and the first Mexican-American to win area-wide office in Los Angeles since 1949. Riles and Nava are both liberals and would clearly emphasize different issues than Rafferty. A divisive primary campaign could insure a victory for the incumbent, although both candidates seem capable of conducting a tough General election campaign. Dwayne T. Canon, a former junior college instructor, has also announced his candidacy.

U.S. SENATOR

United States Senator George Murphy received a giant boost toward re-election on January 15, with the announcement by Dr. S.I. Hayakawa, San Francisco State College President, that he would not be a candidate for public office. Pollsters had indicated that the diminutive semanticist led the incumbent in recent tests of popularity with state voters.

Senator Murphy, armed with a positive physical report from his doctors, will face no opposition in the Republican primary. Finch backers are resigned to the fact that their man will remain with the Nixon Administration for the time being.

Democratic Congressmen John Tunney of Riverside and George Brown of Monterey Park, perhaps joined by their colleague in the House, Phil Burton of San Francisco, will compete for the opportunity to take on the senior Senator. Supreme Court Justice Stanley Mosk, also mentioned as a possible challenger, has joined Hayakawa on the sidelines.

Despite Tunney's friendship with Senator Ted Kennedy and his activist campaign style, many observers believe that Brown will prove to be a tough primary foe. The former physicist has impeccable liberal credentials, including the announced support of Senator Eugene McCarthy and the tacit support of farm worker organizations. Neither challenger seems yet to have attained the statewide stature needed to defeat Murphy.

Seven Measures on June Primary Ballot

Pending disposition of a court suit concerning qualification of a tax revision proposal or legislative action in February, the following seven ballot propositions will be the only state-wide measures on the June 2 ballot.

PROPOSITION NO. 1 — *The University of California Health Facilities Construction Bond Act of 1969.* If the voters approve this measure, $246,300,000 in state bonds can be issued for the development of medical facilities on the campuses of the University of California.

PROPOSITION NO. 2 — *Revision of the California Constitution Article XI Relating to Local Government.* The establishment and governance of cities, counties and towns would be clarified, reorganized, updated and revised. Propositions 2 through 6 in a slightly different form were linked together as Proposition 1 which was defeated in November, 1968.

PROPOSITION NO. 3 — *Revision of the California Constitution Article XII Relating to Public Utilities.* Sections pertaining to corporations would be transferred, deleted and embodied in statutes, and sections relating to public utilities would strengthen and broaden the role of the Legislature and the Public Utilities Commission.

PROPOSITION NO. 4 — *Revision of the California Constitution Article X Relating to State Institutions and Public Buildings and Article XVII relating to Land and Homestead Exemptions.* Generally would delete or transfer obsolete or unnecessary language.

PROPOSITION NO. 5 — *Revision of the California Constitution Articles XVIII which would provide for the revision and amendment of the Constitution and Article XXIV relating to State Civil Service.* Legislative responsibility regarding constitutional changes would be modified and civil service exemptions extended to the Lieutenant Governor and Boards and Commissions and certain flexibility would be provided to the Personnel Board.

PROPOSITION NO. 6 — *Revision of Section 7 of Article IX relating to Education.* Provisions relating to required textbooks and the authority of County Boards and the State Board of Education would be revised, deleted and embodied in statutes.

PROPOSITION NO. 7 — *Revision of Section 1, of Article XVI, relating to State Indebtedness.* Allows the Legislature by 2/3 vote to raise the maximum interest rate on authorized general obligation bonds (in effect, increasing the rate from five to seven percent).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Several major congressional battles are already taking shape. Assembly Education Committee Chairman, Republican Vic Veysey, will battle Congressman John Tunney's Administrative Aide, Dave Tunno, for the 38th District seat which covers Imperial, Riverside and part of San Bernardino County.

The contest to fill the vacuum created by the imminent U.S. Senate candidacy of Congressman George Brown, Jr., may involve Democratic Assemblymen Walter Karabian and David Roberti and State Senator George Danielson, all of whom represent significant portions of the 29th Congressional District. A strong Republic challenge in the General can be expected for this highly marginal Democratic seat. Bill Orozco, a member of the Los Angeles Junior College Board, who has lost to Brown twice in close battles, may make the race once more.

San Jose Congressman Don Edwards, past president of Americans for Democratic Action, unexpectedly announced his retirement and created a wide open fight to replace him. Marc Poche, narrowly defeated for the Assembly seat held by Republican Earl Crandall in 1968, seems to be in the lead for the Democratic nomination. San Jose Mayor Ron James, a Republican, has turned down a chance to run. Santa Clara City Councilman Larry Fargher will probably be the GOP nominee as he was in 1968.

In the 28th District, which stretches from Malibu to Palos Verdes in Los Angeles County, Congressman Alphonzo Bell expects a primary foe in the person of John T. La Follette, the nominee of a coalition headed by conservative Henry Salvatori, a major supporter of Governor Reagan and Los Angeles Mayor Sam Yorty.

Additionally, the death of Congressman Glen Lipscomb of the 24th District in Los Angeles has created a vacancy in the seat which he has held since 1954. State Senator H.L. "Bill" Richardson and former Congressman John Rousselot, both former employees of the John Birch Society, may clash in the GOP primary. Another candiate may be expected from the Claremont complex, the home base of Controller Hugh Flournoy.

STATE SENATE

Former President Pro Tem Hugh Burns, 67, announced his retirement after 34 years of service as a state legislator and was joined a day later by his old friend and fellow coalition leader, Senator Jack McCarthy of Marin County. The two had been the backbone of the group which had run the Senate for over a decade.

Assembly Democratic Caucus Leader George Zenovich of Fresno has declared his intention to run for Burns' seat with Burns' blessing. Jack Ortega, Mexican American Political Association legislative spokesman, may challenge Zenovich in the party primary. Former Fresno Mayor Floyd Hyde, now Assistant Secretary of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, looms as a strong Republican challenger to Zenovich for the Senate job.

Former Marin Supervisor Peter Behr, an ardent conservationist, and Ray Shoen, former McCarthy campaign chairman, have announced their intention to compete in the Republican primary. Democrats Mike Peevey, of the Institute of Industrial Relations at UC Berkeley, and Attorney Dick Adams are Democratic hopefuls. Napa Assemblyman John Dunlap, who has decided to concentrate his efforts on re-election to his 4th District, may watch his 1968 opponent, Fairfield Mayor Don Pinkerton, run against the others in the Republican primary.

State Senators Richard Dolwig of San Mateo and Clark Bradley of Alameda and Santa Clara counties are reportedly going to face conservationist opposition in both their primary and general elections. Mayor Samuel H. Halsted of Portola Valley has announced he will challenge Dolwig because of general dissatisfaction with the Senator's stance on environment issues with particular reference to the Bay Fill controversy. Democrats hope that Republican conservationists will swing behind Attorney Arlen Gregorio in November if they fail to beat Dolwig in their primary.

The maneuvering continues in both parties to find environmentalists capable of beating Bradley. Republic William Horman, an engineer and President of the Santa Clara School Board's Association, and Democrats Robert Girard and John Rutherford are seeking the support of a bi-partisan caucus of conservationists.

Senator Alan Short of Stockton, whose short-lived flirtations with higher office brought speculation that Sacramento County Supervisor Gene Gualco, and San Joaquin Supervisors Carmen Perino and Gary Wiler would compete to succeed him, now may have to face at least one of them before he can look ahead to a general election contest with Mel Riddle, a former aide to Governor Knight and Speaker Monagan.

ASSEMBLY

A host of aspirants will compete for the vacancies created by the departure of several veteran Assemblymen. Ben Reichmuth, Santa Clara County Republican leader seems to have the inside track for Secretary of State Candidate George Milias' seat.

Former Unruh aide Frank Holliman, Inglewood City Councilman David C. Pierson and U.A.W. representative Tom Whelan are likely Democratic hopefuls in the 65th Assembly District which Jess Unruh has represented since 1955. James R. Dunn, who ran against Congressman Charles Wilson in 1968, Councilman Merle Mergell and Mayor William Goedike are possible Republican opponents.

Mentioned as prime candidates to battle for Bill Bagley's Assembly seat are Ernest N. Kettenhofen, member of the California Maritime Academy Board and a former Marin County Supervisor, and Mike Kahl, an aide to HEW Secretary Robert Finch and former assistant to Senator Jack McCarthy.

Incumbent 8th District Assemblyman Walt Powers may be opposed in the Democratic primary by Sacramento Architect and former County Planning Commissioner, John Harvey Carter and Kenneth Robbins, a businessman and past state commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Santa Barbara Republican Assemblyman Don MacGillivray and Los Angeles Assemblyman Leon Ralph and Bill Greene, both Democratics, are reportedly going to be the target of primary challenges as well.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

KEY LEGISLATIVE VOTES

Assembly

1—House Resolution No. 1 providing for the election of Assembly officers was divided into three parts. Question 1 was the vote between Republican Speaker Bob Monagan and Democratic challenger Vincent Thomas. (Monagan 41, Thomas 39.)

2—Question 2 of H.R. 1 dealt with the contest between Speaker pro Tempore Charles Conrad and Assemblyman Carlos Bee, who held the same position under former Speaker Unruh. (Conrad 41, Bee 32.)

3—Assembly Joint Resolution No. 3 by Assemblyman Unruh requested the Federal government act immediately to halt oil drilling in the Santa Barbara Channel. The Democratic Leader moved to wave the rules of the Assembly in order to pass the resolution immediately without reference to committee. Unruh's motion failed (31 to 29) to gain approval of 2/3 of the members, and he eventually joined in co-sponsoring a similar measure, A.J.R. No. 2, authored by Santa Barbara's Don MacGillivray, which passed unanimously 12 days later.

Senate

1—Senate Resolution No. 2 provided for election of officers, including President pro Tempore Howard Way. Passed (39-0).

2—Senator Donald Grunsky moved to suspend the Constitution, in order to proceed with Senate Bill 53 without having to wait until the end of the 30-day bill introduction period. SB 53 would impose liability for damages upon land-owners who lease their land for rock festivals and other large gatherings. He failed to gain a 2/3 vote on his motion (27-1).

53 would impose liability for damages upon land-owners who lease their land for rock festivals and other large gatherings. He failed to gain a 2/3 vote on his motion (27-1).

Y — Yes
N — No
* — Not voting, unannounced
M — Monagan
T — Thomas
C — Conrad
B — Bee

SENATE

Democratic — 19	1	2
ALQUIST (13)	Y	*
BEILENSON (26)	Y	N
BURNS (16)	Y	*
CARRELL (22)	Y	Y
COLLIER (1)	Y	Y
DANIELSON (27)	Y	Y
DILLS (32)	Y	Y
DYMALLY (29)	Y	Y
KENNICK (33)	Y	*
MILLS (40)	Y	Y
MOSCONE (10)	Y	*
PETRIS (11)	Y	Y
RODDA (5)	Y	Y
SHORT (6)	Y	Y
SONG (28)	Y	*
STIERN (18)	Y	Y
TEALE (3)	Y	*
WALSH (30)	Y	Y
WEDWORTH (31)	Y	*

Republican — 21		
BRADLEY (14)	Y	*
BURGENER (38)	Y	Y
COLOGNE (36)	Y	Y
COOMBS (20)	Y	Y
CUSANOVICH (23)	Y	Y
DEUKMEJIAN (37)	Y	*
DOLWIG (12)	*	Y
GRUNSKY (17)	Y	Y
HARMER (21)	Y	*
LAGOMARSINO (24)	Y	Y
MARKS (9)	Y	Y
MARLER (2)	Y	Y
McCARTHY (4)	Y	*
NEJEDLY (7)	Y	Y
RICHARDSON (19)	Y	Y
SCHMITZ (34)	Y	Y
SCHRADE (39)	Y	Y
SHERMAN (8)	Y	Y
STEVENS (25)	Y	Y
WAY (15)	Y	*
WHETMORE (35)	Y	Y

ASSEMBLY

Democrat — 39	1	2	3
BEE (13)	T	*	Y
BRATHWAITE (63)	T	B	Y
BROWN (18)	T	*	*
BURTON (20)	T	B	Y
CORY (69)	T	B	Y
CROWN (14)	T	B	Y
CULLEN (44)	T	B	Y
DEDDEH (77)	T	B	Y
DUNLAP (5)	T	B	Y
FENTON (51)	T	B	Y
FONG (15)	T	B	*
FORAN (23)	T	B	Y
GARCIA (40)	T	*	Y
GONSALVES (66)	T	B	Y
GREENE, B. (53)	T	B	Y
GREENE, L. (3)	T	B	Y
JOHNSON, H. (58)	T	B	Y
KARABIAN (45)	T	*	Y
KNOX (11)	T	B	*
MacDONALD (37)	T	B	Y
McCARTHY (19)	T	B	Y
MILLER (17)	T	*	*
MORETTI (42)	T	B	*
PORTER (38)	T	B	Y
POWERS (8)	T	B	Y
QUIMBY (72)	T	*	*
RALPH (55)	T	B	Y
ROBERTI (48)	T	B	Y
RYAN (27)	T	B	Y
SIEROTY (59)	T	B	Y
THOMAS (68)	T	B	Y
TOWNSEND (67)	T	B	*
UNRUH (65)	T	B	Y
VASCONCELLOS (24)	T	B	Y
WARREN (56)	T	B	Y
WAXMAN (61)	T	B	Y
Z'BERG (9)	T	*	Y
ZENOVICH (32)	T	B	Y

Republican — 41	1	2	3
ARKLIN (41)	M	C	*
BAGLEY (7)	M	C	*
BADHAM (71)	M	C	N
BARNES (78)	M	C	*
BELOTTI (2)	M	C	N
BERRYHILL (30)	M	C	N
BEVERLY (46)	M	C	N
BIDDLE (74)	M	C	N
BRIGGS (35)	M	C	*
BRITSCHGI (26)	M	C	N
BURKE (70)	M	C	N
CAMPBELL (50)	M	C	N
CHAPPIE (6)	M	C	*
COLLIER (54)	M	C	N
CONRAD (57)	M	C	N
CRANDALL (25)	M	C	N
DENT (10)	M	C	N
DUFFY (21)	M	C	N
HAYES (39)	M	C	*
HOM (79)	M	C	*
JOHNSON, R. (4)	M	C	N
KETCHUM (29)	M	C	N
LANTERMAN (47)	M	C	N
LEWIS (73)	M	C	N
MacGILLIVRAY (36)	M	C	N
McGEE (64)	M	C	*
MILIAS (22)	M	C	*
MOBLEY (33)	M	C	N
MONAGAN (12)	M	C	N
MOORHEAD (43)	M	C	N
MULFORD (16)	M	C	N
MURPHY (31)	M	C	*
PRIOLO (60)	M	C	*
RUSSELL (62)	M	C	N
SCHABARUM (49)	M	C	N
STACEY (28)	M	C	N
STULL (80)	M	C	N
VEYSEY (75)	M	C	*
WAKEFIELD (52)	M	C	N
WILSON (76)	M	C	N
WOOD (34)	M	C	N

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Selected State Government Reports

The following list includes public agency reports issued recently. Copies of these reports may be obtained by contacting the agency or committee which wrote them or by requesting them from the Office of Procurement, Documents Section, P.O. Box 20191, Sacramento, Ca. 95814.

the environment

Contra Costa County Water District recommended changes in the proposed federal Kellogg Unit, Central Valley Project. Resources Agency. 12 Dec. 1969.

Eel River Development Alternatives. Bulle. No. 172. Dept. of Water Resources. 12 Dec. 1969. 36 pp. Six alternatives given to the Corps of Engineers proposed Dos Rios Project.

Eel River Flood Control (report requested by ACR 186). Dept. of Water Resources. 6 Jan. 1970. 23 pp. Six alternatives given to the Dos Rios Project with a stress on flood control.

The Disposal of State Interest in the Squaw Valley State Recreation Area. Progress Report No. 8 (Sept. 1969) and No. 9 (Dec. 1969). Dept. of Parks and Recreation.

Vehicle Emission Standards After 1974. Report to the Assembly. Air Resources Board. 29 Dec. 1969.

Report of the California Water Resources Development Finance Committee and Dept. of Water Resources to the Legislature on State Water Resources Development System (State Water Project). 14 Jan. 1970. Many tables.

Defining the California Public Interest in Coastal Zone Management. Calif. Advisory Commission on Marine and Coastal Resources. Jan. 1970.

Study of the Use of DDT and Similar Pesticides on Human Health and the Environment. Dept. of Public Health. 31 Dec. 1969. Includes a section on special problems and state and federal actions.

Air Pollution Control in California. 1969 Annual Report. Air Resources Board. 13 Jan. 1970. 44 pp. A readable booklet telling the Board's activities for the year, giving legislative needs, some charts.

Report on Peripheral Canal Unit (Central Valley Project and State Water Project). Assembly Committee on Water. 14 Oct. 1969. Printed in full in Assembly Journal, Jan. 8, 1970, pp. 100-108.

Comments on the Peripheral Canal (Central Valley Project and State Water Project). Senate Committee on Water Resources. 31 Dec. 1969. Printed in full in Senate Journal 6 Jan. 1970, pp. 20-30. These comments give the Committee's endorsement to the Canal. Also in the Journal are Dept. of Water Resources Director William R. Gianelli's guarantee of performance and Senator John A. Nejedly's minority report.

Report on the California State Development Plan Program. Annual Report. State Office of Planning. Dec. 1969. 4 pp. Brief summary of status of plan with recommendations to the Legislature.

health

Drug Abuse Information Project. Third Annual Report S.F. Medical Center. Univ. of Calif. 5 Jan. 1970. 85 pp. lists study programs under way, education program, Calif. drug abuse agencies, and much other relevant information.

Medi-Cal Pilot Projects. Annual Report to the Legislature. Dept. of Health Care Services. 6 Jan. 1970.

Findings and Recommendations Resulting from an Investigation into the payment of claims of pharmacists under the Medi-Cal Program. Joint Legislative Audit Committee. 8 Jan. 1970. 24 pp. Nine recommendations made by the Auditor General to improve procedures.

"Malnutrition: One Key to the Poverty Cycle." Report by Assembly Committee on Health & Welfare. Jan. 1970. 26 pp. Recommends an increase in AFDC, more county-administered food stamps, expanded school lunch program.

Department of Mental Hygiene's Mental Retardation Research Program. Report of Assembly Committee on Ways and Means. 15 Jan. 1970.

education

Report on Fine Arts Instruction in California Schools. Dept. of Ed. 23 Oct. 1969. 9 pp. Brief look at programs and teacher training.

Financing and Operation of the Children's Centers Programs. Joint Legislative Audit Committee. 14 Jan. 1970. Selected school districts were examined. Auditor General recommends consolidating program-coordination in one agency.

Review of Instructional Television Programs. Joint Legislative Audit Committee. 15 Jan. 1970. Selected school districts and state agencies examined. The Auditor General recommends a statewide study.

High Interest Rates Stall School Building Aid. 1968-1969 Report to the Legislature. State Allocation Board. 5 Jan. 1970. 18 pp.

Fiscal and Budget Controls for the California State Colleges. Report by Joint Legislative Budget Committee. 14 Jan. 1970.

potpourri

Effectiveness of California Work Incentive Programs for Welfare Recipients. First Annual Report. Dept. of Human Resources. 8 Jan. 1970.

California Public Library Development Board. Sixth Annual Report. Calif. State Library. 25 Sept. 1969. 11 pp. Includes maps and charts.

Statement of Expenditures of Oil Revenue. Long Beach City Attorney. 30 Sept. 1969.

California State Personnel Board. 1969 Annual Report on State Salaries and Personnel Management. 19 Dec. 1969. Sections on employee compensation and benefits, employer-employee relations, and the merit system.

Report to the Governor and Legislature. Board of Administration. Public Employees' Retirement System. Dec. 1969. 27 pp. Reports on their program, accomplishments, recommendations, social security, health care.

"Ethical Conduct and Governmental Integrity . . . The Conflict of Interest Issue." Joint Staff Report prepared by the Assembly Office of Research and the Govt. Organization Committee. Feb. 1970. Obtain from the Office of Research.

Report of the Select Committee on Assembly Reorganization. Dec. 1969. 28 pp. Recommends biennial session to improve legislative procedures. Draft of proposed constitutional amendment included.

The Recipient Fraud Incidence Study. The Fraud Review Panel for the Dept. of Social Welfare, Human Resources Agency. Jan. 1970. Part I Study and Findings, 20 pp. Part II Recommendations, 12 pp. 30 recommendations given.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

California Journal . . .

A new way to keep abreast of the constant ebb and flow of information about what's happening in California government.

If you'd like to read our monthly digest at your leisure, take advantage of the Charter subscription price of $10 by mailing in the coupon below. You'll save $5 (the regular price is $15) if you act now.

California Journal
1108 O Street
Sacramento, California 95814

Please enter my 1-year individual charter subscription to California Journal for $10:

☐ PAYMENT ENCLOSED
☐ BILL ME
☐ CHARGE TO MY MASTER CHARGE CARD
#_____

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

TOWN _____ STATE _____ ZIP _____

OCCUPATION _____ ORGANIZATION _____

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Knowledge will forever govern ignorance. And a people who mean to be their own governors, must arm themselves with the power knowledge gives."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED